

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Wednesday, March 13, 1974

[The House met at 2:30 o'clock.]

PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure in introducing to all hon. members, through you, the Grade 5 class of McKee School in Edmonton, located just on the boundary of my constituency and that of the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs.

Just before I ask them to stand and be recognized in the usual way, Mr. Speaker, I wanted to say that last week I spent about one hour with them at their school and was questioned closely. I would have to say to hon. members present that there are some very, very good potential members of the opposition or government, as the case may be - certainly of the House - in that class, a few years down the road.

So I would like to ask them now, along with their teachers Mrs. Ross and Miss Kato to stand and be recognized.

MR. ASHTON:

Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the hon. Mr. Yurko, the Minister of the Environment, who is meeting with the federal government, I take great pleasure in introducing to you and through you to the members of this Assembly, a group of students from Capilano School in Gold Bar constituency. They are accompanied by three of their teachers, Mrs. Cruikshank, Mrs. Gabert and Mrs. Nemirsky and by four parents who are showing a keen interest in this visit to the Assembly.

I would ask the parents, the teachers and the students to please stand and be recognized.

TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the annual report of the Alberta Disaster Services Agency. There will be enough copies available so that it can be distributed to all hon. members.

In addition to that, Mr. Speaker, I would like to table some of the documents I was using last night; I suggested to hon. members that I would in regard to the Agricultural Development Corporation lending policy in the past year. Additional copies are also available if the hon. members want them.

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to table the annual report of the Department of Lands and Forests covering the time period April 1, 1972 through March 31, 1973. There are 75 copies being arranged for members.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Food Prices

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct two questions, the first question to the Minister of Consumer Affairs. In light of the announcement made in Ottawa today that food prices have increased 2.6 per cent over the last month, I would like to ask the Minister of Consumer Affairs what portion of that increase the Alberta Department of Consumer Affairs considers justified?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please. This is obviously a question of opinion which is a matter of debate rather than a matter of information.

MR. CLARK:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Consumer Affairs. In light of the announcement made by the federal government through Statistics Canada, what new initiative does the Department of Consumer Affairs in Alberta plan to become involved in immediately to monitor seriously these types of increases in food costs?

MR. DOWLING:

Mr. Speaker, the figures are not quite correct. The adjusted figure for all items from Statistics Canada is a one per cent increase, and that is a rather interesting figure, Mr. Speaker, bearing in mind that over the past twelve months the rate of escalation for Alberta in all commodity groups, except recreation, is decidedly lower than the national average.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Does the Government of Alberta not accept the figures of Statistics Canada when it reports that the increase in food prices for last month was 2.6 per cent?

MR. DOWLING:

Yes of course we accept these statistics, Mr. Speaker, and we are - I should answer the other question - we are consciously monitoring all types of things, potatoes for example. We have had some contact with groups out of our province. An indication that one of the major reasons why the price of potatoes rose during that period was the failure of the Asian rice crop, the low Indian crop production, the Australian drought, U.S. early wet fall and the fact that now potatoes are selling in Idaho for ...

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. Possibly the hon. minister is going to trigger a series of supplementaries on potatoes. Perhaps we should get back to the question.

MR. NOTLEY:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Please, may the hon. minister be permitted to complete his answer to the question.

MR. DOWLING:

Just one other point, Mr. Speaker. The price of those potatoes last year was \$78 per hundredweight.

MR. NOTLEY:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. minister. In the light of his comment that price increases in Alberta are lower than the national average, could the hon. minister table in the Assembly the statistics which would back up that statement?

MR. DOWLING:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, those statistics are available through Statistics Canada and are the regional price indexes for all of last year as presented by Statistics Canada.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary McCall with a supplementary.

MR. HO LEM:

In view of the present proposed increase in bread prices, has the minister given any consideration to a provincially initiated bread subsidy?

MR. DOWLING:

We have not, but as the hon. member will probably remember, there is some subsidy now for wheat and other programs by the Department of Agriculture which, in fact, are subsidies for the consumer. I have, Mr. Speaker, instructed the people in the Consumers Affairs Branch to contact the major bakeries in Alberta in hopes that we can hold the price down below what the national price will be.

MR. TAYLOR:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. minister. In the monitoring of food prices is recognition given to the price paid to the producer, and is that then weighed against the price paid by the consumer?

MR. DOWLING:

Mr. Speaker, we have it on fairly good authority from Mrs. Plumptre's commission that she has examined with her committee the price flow of all food commodities right through and finds that there is no escalated amount of profit in any one of those areas. We assume that her statistics are fairly accurate - or very accurate - and use those rather than duplicating this cost.

Human Rights Commission - Nursing Aides

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct this second question to the Minister of Manpower and Labour, and ask the minister if he has asked the Alberta Human Rights Commission to check into the alleged discrimination against certified nursing aides to the Royal Alexandra Hospital?

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, this particular case is now before the Human Rights Commission.

MR. CLARK:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the minister. At what time does the government expect to receive a report from the commission? In other words, has the government given this priority?

DR. HOHOL:

It's difficult to say, Mr. Speaker. I've approved an investigator on behalf of the Human Rights Commission to investigate and to report. The report comes usually at the time when the investigator completes. This could be as early as three weeks. It could take considerably more time depending on the nature of the case.

MR. CLARK:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the minister. Did the Government of Alberta have a study done by officials of the Treasury Department to see what the price tag would be for implementation of equal pay for equal work?

MR. SPEAKER:

This is scarcely a supplementary, but perhaps the minister might wish to answer it briefly and then we could go on to another topic.

MR. CLARK:

On a point of order. If I could say, Mr. Speaker, that the whole question of the certified nursing aides approach deals with the concept of equal pay for equal work and that is why, Mr. Speaker, I submit that it is.

MR. SPEAKER:

Had the hon. member referred his supplementary to that particular sector he would have been directly in line with the question.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, then may I rephrase the question to the minister?

In light of the concern raised by the certified nursing aides in keeping with the concept approved by this Legislature of equal pay for equal work, has the Government of Alberta had a study done by officials of the Treasury Department to see the cost of implementing that concept?

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, I have to put it this way, that a study in the literal sense of the word has not occurred, but certain estimates that would have to do with increasing the cost of a particular kind of service were made.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary question to the minister. Is it true that the price tag involved with implementation of equal pay for equal work is estimated at \$40 million and is ...

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. The question is of questionable compliance with the requirements of the question period, and I believe we should go on to another topic and perhaps we can come back to this.

The hon. Member for Smoky River followed by the hon. Member for Calgary McCall.

Toll-Free Exchanges

MR. MOORE:

Mr. Speaker, a question to the hon. Minister of Telephones and Utilities with regard to toll-free exchanges. Has the minister been able to make a decision yet with regard to the inclusion of the Donnelly telephone exchange and toll-free service to both McLennan and Falher?

MR. FARRAN:

Mr. Speaker, in view of the location of McLennan, Donnelly and Falher, the matter of flat-rate calling was reconsidered and I'm happy to confirm that Donnelly and McLennan will be getting toll-free calling during October, 1975, as well as the already confirmed McLennan and Falher route. There will be no additional costs assessed against either McLennan or Donnelly.

But I'd like to make it clear, Mr. Speaker, that the general rule is for one route per small centre in phase one. Donnelly already had a route between Donnelly and Falher, however after a favourable ballot, there will be toll-free calling between McLennan and Falher and Donnelly is half way between, so we've agreed that Donnelly will get two routes, McLennan-Donnelly and Donnelly-Falher.

MR. BENOIT:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, if I may. Would the minister inform the House, because of questions raised, why it will be so long from the time a petition has been taken to the time that the toll-free service is put in? For instance in the area of Blackie and High River the necessary petition has been filed and it is agreed that it will go in, but it won't go in until the end of 1975. Why is there such a gap?

MR. FARRAN:

Mr. Speaker, the EFRC was originally a five-year program, as announced in the spring last year. The hon. member will recall from the brief debate on the Speech from the Throne that EFRC is to be accelerated. A five-year program is now being compressed into two years. The engineering will start in September, 1974 and be completed in November, 1975.

The reason it takes time is that more capacity has to be built into both the switch exchange and the lines. Because there is no longer rationing by the purse through the toll-by-toll charges, teenagers are inclined to stay longer on the line, people call more frequently and the whole object of the exercise would be frustrated if all they got was a busy signal. So engineering has to be carried out, there are delays in the delivery of equipment and so on. It's quite remarkable that we've been able to put a five-year program into what amounts to two years. This is by virtue of overtime and so on being performed by AGT engineers.

MR. RUSTE:

A supplementary question to the minister. In the original opinion poll, there was no mention made of the extra charges. What was the reason for that?

MR. FARFAN:

Well, Mr. Speaker, in a democracy there are all sorts of checks and controls - I think we all know how Britain lost the Empire and wonder how she won the war, but it is our way of life - so the first check is to find out which route they want.

There's a ration of one route each from a small centre to a large market centre. So the first ballot must determine which one they'd like. Then you calculate according to the Public Utilities Board rules - and they lay down the rules for the referendum - how much it will cost. They divide the capital cost by the number of people at both ends. So the per capita cost is smaller in the larger centre than in the smaller centre, and this is the way the PUB has set it up. AGT is not completely master of its own destiny in this regard. It's regulated by the Public Utilities Board.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary McCall followed by the hon. Member for Stony Plain.

Geriatric Home - Inquiry

MR. HO LEM:

Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Health and Social Development. With regard to the two women retained unnecessarily for a number of years in the Raymond geriatric home, has the minister ordered an inquiry to investigate the cause of this error?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I could tell the hon. member that the cause, of course, is directly related to the policies that were in effect at the time they entered the Raymond institution some years ago. Maybe the hon. members opposite would have a greater understanding of those than I have. When the new Mental Health Act was passed in early 1973 the former Raymond mental hospital was made a special care institution for geriatric patients.

Mr. Speaker, in order to be brief and not enter into debate on the issue at all I think many of the people who are in a home like that are not able to function adequately. Particularly after a number of years of confinement there, they are not able to function adequately on their own. Some are. The department does have a continuous program of reassessment and reappraisal of all patients which has brought down the population of mental hospitals enormously. In fairness to hon. members opposite, that program began when the hon. Member for Wetaskiwin-Leduc was Minister of Health. We have as a whole, brought down the populations greatly and in each case reassessment is made in order to determine if a person is, in fact, likely to be able to function outside.

Although I have no detailed specifics in this particular case, I think I do have an appreciation of the type of circumstance involved in the case of these two ladies. There was some time spent with them by a volunteer worker who, by supporting these individuals in a slightly different style of life than they had become accustomed to in the institution over so many years, was able to give them the sort of support they needed outside the institution in the community.

This is supported 100 per cent by all department policies and is the sort of thing that has been going on. We certainly hope to see more people being able to make that move.

MR. HO LEM:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Can the minister assure this House that all patients in this type of institution will be advised of their rights?

MR. CRAWFORD:

I think that's a very relevant question, Mr. Speaker. The formal advising of a patient, particularly one who has been institutionalized for many years and may be advanced in years himself, may or may not serve a purpose - to say directly, I now advise you of your rights.

However, people work with them in these reassessments all the time in the hope that the sorts of relationships can be developed that will result in the person having his lifestyle at least changed, if not necessarily discharged fully. That is an ongoing process and I think it has gone reasonably well.

There are two sides to it. Sometimes people have said that too many have been discharged.

Mental Health Patients

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Minister of Health and Social Development. Have there been a number of complaints from the nursing homes in the Province of Alberta which have been taking care of those persons released from mental institutions, such as Raymond and others?

MR. CRAWFORD:

I don't know about the reference to Raymond particularly, Mr. Speaker, but from some relatives of people who are patients in nursing homes, I have from time to time received the view that [with] some other residents of nursing homes where their relatives were, some difficulties have arisen because of the unsuitability, in the view of the person complaining, of the nursing home to look after a formal mental patient.

There are only two things I would like to say to that, to keep my answer short, Mr. Speaker. In the recent, celebrated Edmonton case, much publicized, the alleged aggressor was not a former mental patient. Many people made that presumption but that was not so. The alleged aggressor was admitted to that nursing home under the nursing home's normal admission procedures, according to the information I have been given. The only other thing is that the policy of decentralization of patients from mental hospitals has brought with it some of these difficulties. We do think they are capable of being worked out. Moving people into the community, that is into the nursing home as opposed to a formal institution, has definitely benefited many. The policy of the department is that where a case comes up where that has caused a particular difficulty then the person would be readmitted, provided the proper steps for that are gone through.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Could the hon. minister tell the House, with respect to the reassessment program, at what intervals this reassessment will occur? Will it be once a year, once every six months? And further, will there be any travelling psychiatrist visiting homes such as the Raymond institution?

MR. CPAWFOPD:

Mr. Speaker, the travelling services may not to this point have serviced, Raymond in particular, as well as they could have. There are travelling services, they have been at work and they have been visiting the various institutions. There are several more, of course. There is Claresholm, in addition to the formal mental hospitals - Rosehaven. In some respects Gunn and Yungstown are similar, although they are not exactly the same type of institution.

The frequency of visits really depends more on - rather than saying that each patient is assessed every year, for example, it is important that the institution have access to a continuous reappraisal so that patients who do need it, in the minds of the patients themselves or in the view of the medical people working with them, can have reassessments as required.

In concluding that, Mr. Speaker, I would just say that our actual capacity to provide travelling teams is something that has been difficult to build up to an optimum measure because of the fact that with the populations formerly so high in the mental homes there was a great bulge of work that had to be done at once with respect to them. When the patient load is more normal then a more regularized type of thing would be possible than has been so far.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Drumheller with a final supplementary on this topic.

MR. TAYLOR:

A supplementary question to the hon. minister. Has the hon. minister any estimate of the number of such patients who have left and those still remaining who chose to remain? Secondly, is any financial assistance as well as counselling given to those who decide to leave, to help them adapt to the outside world?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I don't know the actual number, even in generalities, of those who have had the opportunity to leave but have chosen to stay. I don't know that. I do know the overall populations which in large generalized figures would have been in the 1,300 or 1,400 range in both Oliver and Ponoka and much less at the other five places I mentioned. In the heavily loaded ones of a few years ago, Oliver and Ponoka, those populations have been about cut in two or a little less. This was considered an important part of the program.

As far as financial support is concerned, that is given to a person who is discharged if there is a need. They, in effect, become social assistance clients.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Stony Plain followed by the hon. Member for Hanna-Oyen.

Syncrude - Employment Requirements

MR. PURDY:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Advanced Education. Could the minister inform the House if the universities in Alberta are geared to graduate the number of engineering students who will be required for the Alberta oil sands development?

MR. FOSTER:

Mr. Speaker, I understand that representatives of Syncrude and the industry generally had some discussions with university people in the last week or so - or according to the Edmonton Journal that took place - and remarks were made at that time that Syncrude could accommodate a considerable number of graduate engineers who were not currently available in the Alberta economy or system.

I think it is fair to say, Mr. Speaker, that all university and college faculties who are responsible for the training of people who will be utilized in the Syncrude project in northeast Alberta have been put on notice of the kinds of demands that will be made upon them.

Our responsibility is to ensure, as I think we have, that the universities are aware of the demands that we placed on them, and moreover that high school students, who will become the university students of tomorrow, are aware of these opportunities.

This is a subject of some continuing discussion between my department and the universities, and it may interest the House, Mr. Speaker, that we will be producing a small document later this spring for distribution to all high school students in the province relative to post-secondary educational opportunities, and specifically the kinds of employment opportunities that will arise out of the Syncrude project.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Hanna-Oyen followed by the hon. Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest.

Plastic Pipe - Sales Tax

MR. FPENCH:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Provincial Treasurer. In view of the extensive use of plastic pipe for rural gas, has the government given consideration to asking the federal government if plastic pipe could be exempted from the payment of sales tax, the same exemption as applies to use in agricultural products?

MR. MINIELY:

My Speaker, I'm smiling because I think the hon. federal Minister of Finance has now about three letters on his desk asking him to reduce or eliminate certain forms of taxation.

I think I confirmed that the other day with respect to the capital gains tax, and I believe there is another letter relative to the elimination or removal of the sales tax on road oil used for municipal purposes. I fear, Mr. Speaker, that if he gets many more he is going to think I have a sinister plot aimed at eroding the federal government's revenue base.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

MR. MINIELY:

I'm certainly prepared to consider sending another letter with respect to the item the hon. member mentions.

MR. LUDWIG:

Supplementary to the hon. minister with reference to his plot to reduce the revenue of the federal government. Has he got any plot to reduce the taxes that Albertans pay in this province?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest followed by the hon. Member for Calgary McKnight.

Campsites

MR. DRAIN:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Premier or to the appropriate minister in charge of this particular subject.

Are there any plans contemplated to change the present method of campsite camp shelters along the highways of the Province of Alberta or, as has been reported, to move them into the area of private enterprise?

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Speaker, the subject the hon. member is referring to comes from a report of a delegation that was received by the government. That was a brief put forward by a private association in regard to the subject mentioned. It is not the intention to turn the areas within provincial parks or the forest recreation areas over to private enterprise - those are the campsites that are under the Department of Lands and Forests - or to my knowledge with respect to the highway campsites.

I would add, however, Mr. Speaker, that one of the seven 'policy parameters of the parks' position paper tabled in the House in May, 1973, did emphasize the development as a rural development opportunity of private enterprise campsites outside provincial parks.

Fish Creek Provincial Park

While I'm on my feet, Mr. Speaker, I might also clarify a matter that I offered to clarify yesterday. I was asked when the information relative to land purchases on Fish Creek in Calgary would be available to the House and I replied, on behalf of the hon. Minister of the Environment, that I understood they already had. I can confirm that on December 13 that information was tabled in this House.

MR. NOTLEY:

A supplementary question. I would like to ask the hon. ...

MR. SPFAKER:

I believe the hon. minister's supplementary answer may obviate the supplementary question.

MR. DOWLING:

Mr. Speaker, just briefly, if I might supplement the answer of the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests. Through the cooperation of the Lands and Forests Department, the Department of Culture, Youth and Recreation and the Department of Highways, Travel Alberta is commissioning a study, which will be undertaken very quickly, on the entire matter of campsites and picnic areas throughout the province, to determine what the problems are - if there are problems - with them, and what, in fact, should happen down the road. It should be completed by the fall, although I hate to be pinned to that date. I am not sure how long it will take. It will be under way very shortly.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to either of the hon. ministers. In view of the suggestion made by the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests that private enterprise might play a role in further campsite development, my question to him, Mr. Speaker, is to ask whether or not the government foresees public expenditures on additional campsites to be operated as the present ones are?

DR. WARRACK:

Very much so. As a matter of fact, that is another of the policy parameters in that same position paper relative to the expansion of the provincial parks system. And at that time, if the member reviews that policy position paper, he'll note we have tripled that commitment to parks, including campsites, particularly in the more remote areas of the province.

MR. TAYLOR:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Minister of Highways or to the hon. Minister of Tourism. Is there any thought of phasing out the camp kitchens along the highways?

MR. DOWLING:

Not as far as Travel Alberta is concerned. The Minister of Highways might have a supplementary answer.

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, there is no intention of phasing out any of the campsites in the province of Alberta.

MR. SPFAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary McKnight followed by the hon. Member for Sedgewick-Coronation.

Early Childhood Services

MR. LEE:

A question for the Minister of Education. Have you received, or has your department received any representations from early childhood associations to assist them financially in providing their fourth-quarter grants for their kindergartens at the beginning of the

fourth quarter rather than at the end of their fiscal year? If so, what has been the reply?

MR. HYNDMAN:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, we are sensitive to that concern by a small percentage of the 367 rural and urban early childhood services programs now in existence. The question may be solved, we feel, by perhaps increasing from the present payment of 75 per cent of the fourth-quarter grant to perhaps 85 or 90 per cent to obviate the necessity for bridge financing for these groups.

Certainly, though, the problem is being looked into at the moment and it does affect a small percentage of the 15,000 youngsters in early childhood programs now.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Sedgewick-Coronation followed by the hon. Member for Wainwright.

Metric System

MR. SORENSON:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Education. Is the Department of Education revising the curriculum to prepare students for conversion to the metric system which will be coming in Canada in the next years?

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, there has been a good deal of work done on that and I was going to report on it during debate, perhaps under The School Act or the Estimates. But certainly the members of the Assembly and the school system will very shortly be getting quite used to using grams, litres and meters in their conversation. I am surprised, Mr. Speaker, that the opposition didn't see fit to bring it up in the Throne Speech when they cut it short.

[Laughter]

MR. SORENSON:

A supplementary to the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. Has any representation been made to the federal government to ensure standardization in content and terminology?

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, as we reported before in the House, there is a considerable amount of intergovernmental coordination going on between the Government of Alberta and all provinces with the federal government on these very matters.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Wainwright followed by the hon. Member for Vermilion-Viking.

Farm Implement Act

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Agriculture. It deals with The Farm Implement Act and the amendments we had last fall.

Have the regulations been completed respecting the supply of parts in an emergency?

DR. HORNER:

The agreement has been reached with the dealers and the machine companies through the Farm Machinery Appeal Board on a proposal to provide 48 hour repair service to farmers throughout the province. I would caution though, Mr. Speaker, that the period of shortage in relation to steel and other materials is going to make the supply of repairs and, indeed, machinery, very difficult in the coming year.

MR. RUSTE:

This is a supplementary question. Has this been put into regulation then, or is it just an agreement?

DR. HORNER:

I'm not really sure. I will check on that, Mr. Speaker. It has been an agreement between all parties involved.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Vermilion-Viking followed by the hon. Member for Lloydminster.

Consumer Groups - Grants

MR. COOPER:

Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Consumer Affairs. Does the government provide any financial aid to the Alberta branch of the Canadian Association of Consumers other than the recently announced grant of \$6,500?

MR. DOWLING:

Mr. Speaker, we have provided that amount as the hon. member suggests. However, you will notice when the budget is presented, or when our estimates are brought forward, that we have set aside an amount - which we hope will be passed - to provide a fund so that consumer organizations of one kind or another can receive financial assistance in order that they [may] make presentations when hearings or investigations of various things about which they are concerned are held throughout the province.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Lloydminster followed by the hon. Member for Highwood.

Feed Grains Costs

MR. J. MILLER:

Mr. Speaker, I direct my question to the Minister of Agriculture. Have there been any developments in the federal government's attitude regarding the high cost of feed grains and the fact that cattle feeders at this time are experiencing a loss on the fat cattle they are now selling?

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, in regard to the latter part of the question, as I said last night in response to part of the debate, I am hopeful that an announcement will come from Ottawa this week from the federal Minister of Agriculture, in relation to the cattle situation.

Insofar as the feed grain is concerned, I have now had return correspondence from the minister in charge of the Wheat Board, Mr. Lang, at least partially fulfilling my request to him, and that is that the Wheat Board will now forward contract feed grains on a 50-day basis. Up until now it has been on a two-week basis and it has been a continual spiral. We think this step is a first step in stabilizing the entire livestock industry in the West.

MR. NOTLEY:

A supplementary question. Can the minister advise the House whether or not the Alberta government has developed a policy with respect to feed grain once the interim policy lapses this summer?

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, on previous occasions in this House I have given a very definitive statement in regard to feed grains. There will be additional legislation coming up and I'm quite sure the hon. member will partake in that debate and we will lay out the policy again in the Legislature.

MR. COOKSON:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the minister. In your communication with Ottawa, has there been any discussion or any action taken with regard to the import of meat containing DES into the country?

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, at the moment no definitive action has been taken by the federal government that I'm aware of. In my communication to the federal minister, I pointed out to him that the law of Canada prohibits the use of DES in feeding livestock. Surely that law should apply to the federal government as well as everybody else in Canada. We would like to see, from health grounds if no other grounds, that meat fed DES should not be imported to this country.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Highwood followed by the hon. Member for Medicine Hat-Redcliff.

Mackenzie Highway

MR. BENOIT:

My question, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Highways and Transport. Does the government intend to complete totally the Mackenzie Highway to the Northwest Territories this year?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, it is not our intention to complete it this year. As the hon. Member for Highwood might know, there are something like 118 miles between High Level and the 60th parallel. It is a long project. We are anticipating, however, to perhaps be able to do an additional 25 miles this year, north of High Level.

MR. BENOIT:

A supplementary. Does the minister have any projected idea when it will be completed and where it comes in priority so far as other roads are concerned?

AN. HON. MEMBER:

It's a 'high level' priority.

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, it has a very high priority and we will be doing it as soon as it is possible.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Medicine Hat-Redcliff followed by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview.

Petrochemical Plant - Southern Alberta

MR. WYSE:

My question, Mr. Speaker, is to the hon. Premier. Does the provincial government plan to make a joint announcement with the federal government soon regarding a proposed \$300 million petrochemical plant for southern Alberta?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, no.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview followed by the hon. Member for Clover Bar.

Energy Supplies Allocation Board

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct this question to the hon. Premier. Has the Government of Alberta had an opportunity to formulate a position with respect to the role and function of the new Energy Supplies Allocation Board recently set up by the federal government and passed by the recent session of the federal House of Commons?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, we have been assessing that in the energy committee of cabinet. We have suggested an individual from the Province of Alberta who might be a part of that emergency allocation board, but it appears that the federal government was somewhat overly concerned. We've had our man standing by and my information is they haven't had a meeting yet.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Premier. Has any member of this government had an opportunity to meet with the chairman privately or with any other member of the board?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, we haven't considered that necessary. If they were in such a panic to get together with their board and we appointed the person they wanted from Alberta - and they haven't felt there was a sufficient need to even call a meeting.

MR. NOTLEY:

One final supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In view of the rather sweeping powers of the energy allocation board, has the government considered the impact of the board on provincial rights?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, we definitely have. We have had some considerable concern and we would hope that we would receive support for our concern from all corners of the Legislature.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Clover Bar followed by the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View.

Correctional Institutes - Warden

DR. BUCK:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to address my question to the Solicitor General. In light of the fact that we seem to have a severe shortage of wardens in our correctional institutes, I would like to know what steps the government is taking to fill these positions.

MISS HUNLEY:

Mr. Speaker, we are taking the usual steps by advertising and recruitment.

DR. BUCK:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a supplementary question. Can the hon. minister advise the Legislature if she has any indication when these positions will be filled?

MISS HUNLEY:

I'm in touch with my department almost daily, but I haven't asked them within the last couple of days how many applications they have or what the status is. I would be pleased to check and advise the hon. member.

DR. BUCK:

Mr. Speaker, my question was, does the hon. minister have a date when she feels she can fill these positions? Has there been a deadline established, or are we going to go on ad infinitum without a warden?

AN HON. MEMBER:

It wouldn't make any difference to you, Walter.

MISS HUNLEY:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I suppose maybe I could go out and draft somebody, but I don't think this is Russia. So we will fill it as fast as we get suitable candidates.

DR. BUCK:

A further supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Three or four months doesn't seem to be too much of a rush obviously. But I would like to know from the minister, have the deputy wardens applied for the positions - if she can inform the House.

MISS HUNLEY:

Mr. Speaker, they don't apply to me personally. We have a personnel department which handles those. I have not checked with the personnel department to find the status of who has applied and who has not.

MR. WILSON:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Solicitor General. Can the Solicitor General advise if she intentionally left out the word "promotion" when she mentioned that they were going to fill the positions of warden by recruitment and advertising?

MISS HUNLEY:

Well, part of the policy of recruitment has to be promotion or you don't recruit very suitable candidates.

MR. WILSON:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Could the Solicitor General advise if by promotion she means promotion from within the existing ranks of the service?

MISS HUNLEY:

I have already advised that I don't know whether anyone from the existing staff has applied for the position. If they have, they will be given consideration, I'm sure.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View followed by the hon. Member for Drumheller.

Calgary Court House

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Public Works with regard to the construction of the additional floors to the Calgary Court House. Will the project be tendered by DPW for different services like plumbing, mechanical, et cetera or will one contractor take the whole project on a cost-plus basis?

DR. BACKUS:

As I explained in my last answer, it is a project management by APW which means that the different aspects of the project will be tendered separately. In fact, some have already been tendered. This will be handled in the normal way that a project management project is handled.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, will any of the construction be handled on a cost-plus basis?

DR. BACKUS:

Not to the best of my knowledge. Each part of the project, each of the sub-contractors, is contracted on a normal contractual basis, not on a cost-plus basis.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, in light of the minister's admission that not to the best of his knowledge - will he become informed and advise this House more specifically as to whether this will be so or not?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Order, order.

MR. LUDWIG:

It's a proper question.

DR. BACKUS:

I have been very well informed, and the information I have, which is I think comprehensive on the matter, indicates that we have none of them on a cost-plus basis. Now I'm not prepared to say that if we get somebody in to put a nail into the front doorstep that we might not do that project on a cost-plus basis, but in the normal method of contracting the normal procedure is being followed.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Drumheller followed by the hon. Member for Calgary Millican.

Beef Prices

MR. TAYLOR:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the hon. Minister of Consumer Affairs. Having regard to the facts, one, that there has been no increase in the price of beef to the producer during the last month and, two, that from your statement there has been no undue profiteering by middlemen, how is the price of beef to the consumer being increased? As Statistics Canada stated, this is one of the main reasons for the sharp increase in the cost of living this last month.

MR. DOWLING:

Mr. Speaker, as I understand the situation, there is a certain lag period in all the food commodities. In some instances the lag period is up to two months. In one instance which we monitored, one of the major companies which buys beef in Alberta, one of the major retailers, had a fairly large supply of beef available at a fairly inexpensive price. They sold it at that price. However, some of their competitors were forced to buy beef at a higher price and were also forced to compete. They actually sold it as what you might call a loss leader. So I suppose the answer to the hon. member's question is that there is always a lag period and that probably is the only way it is explained.

MR. TAYLOR:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Does this lag go beyond two months, because there has been no increase in the price of beef to the producer during the last two months that I know of?

MR. DOWLING:

Right. In our contact with Mrs. Plumptre's committee, she indicates some considerable concern, as she expressed at our meeting on food marketing held in Alberta just recently in conjunction with the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Consumers Affairs. She indicated she had some considerable concern in this regard and I believe the committee's next report will be out within a month or so. At that time she expects to have some answers to the problems that the hon. member expresses.

MR. CLARK:

Supplementary question to the minister. Has the Alberta Department of Consumer Affairs done some specific studies on this question of the lags? It seems to me that when the price of beef goes down, the lag is a great distance and the consumer doesn't get the advantage, and when the price goes up the lag is there awful quick.

MR. DOWLING:

Yes, as I indicated, Mr. Speaker, the lag is often because of supplies that are on hand, and when there is an integrated operation in many cases they buy in large

quantities, perhaps two months at a time. As I indicated in this one instance, the price was maintained at a particular level, yet some of the competitors were forced to compete at that level and maintain that price. So it's a very difficult thing to monitor on an individual basis. We're trying very hard to develop that kind of system but it's going to take some time.

MR. TAYLOR:

A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview might proceed with his supplementary, followed by a final supplementary by the hon. member for Drumheller.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. In light of your previous answer has the government or your department had an opportunity to investigate the profits of the meat-packing chains, in particular, the 36 per cent increase enjoyed by Canada Packers Limited?

MR. DOWLING:

No, Mr. Speaker, however, as I indicated, the Plumptre commission stated pretty categorically at our conference on food marketing that there was no excessive profit being made at any level, as far as they were able to determine at that time.

MR. TAYLOR:

A supplementary to the hon. minister. In light of the statement by Statistics Canada, would the hon. minister ask Mrs. Plumptre to recheck her figures, or better still, would the Department of Consumer Affairs in Alberta make a check of this thing? There must be an increase some place!

MR. DOWLING:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, of course we will. If we can get some information in the next few days I'll certainly get back, on a one-to-one basis with the member.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary Millican followed by the hon. Member for Calgary Bow.

Alberta Petroleum Marketing Commission

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct my question to the hon. the Premier. Has the Alberta Petroleum Marketing Commission or any of its members submitted to the government an assessment of the price that Alberta oil should rise to when the federal government freeze is removed?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, there have only been preliminary and tentative discussions in that direction as of this time.

MR. DIXON:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the Premier, to do with the Alberta Petroleum Marketing Commission. What liaison is planned between the Alberta Petroleum Marketing Commission and the federal marketing commission? Can they be complementary to each other in the marketing of oil in Canada?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, as of now there is no federal marketing commission. There is of course, the National Energy Board in terms of the portion of export and there has been some liaison developed there, as between the Alberta Petroleum Marketing Commission and the National Energy Board and the Alberta Energy Resources Conservation Board. If the Minister of Mines and Minerals has anything further to add ...?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary Bow.

Maternity Leave

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Manpower and Labour. Can the minister advise if it is the intention of the government to introduce legislation making maternity leave available by statute for all women in Alberta?

DR. HOHOL:

It is not, Mr. Speaker, a specific consideration for legislation, but the whole problem of the female in the labour force is a matter of consideration to government.

Career Counselling Centres

MR. WILSON:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. minister. Can the minister advise if it is the government's intention to establish centres which would provide women in Alberta with career counselling and training?

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say in all frankness that it would likely be a kind of discriminatory move if we were to move that way. If we are going to have regional or community centres which will provide career, occupational and other kinds of assistance, including counselling, it is a fact that in these kinds of centres whatever person, student, male, female, in the labour force or out of it, will be able to get assistance.

MR. WILSON:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. minister. Can the minister advise if he has instructed the Alberta Human Rights Commission to initiate investigations into those occupations and industries which employ large groups of women?

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, what has occurred is that the branch people in the Department of Manpower and Labour have from time to time undertaken examinations of such kinds of concerns as the honourable gentleman puts forth because they wanted to know what the nature of the circumstances are. It is not the intention of the minister or the government to direct the commission in what it knows its work to be. The program will be mostly educational. If there's ever a complaint in this area with respect to discrimination that will come to the commission in the normal procedure set up for complaints to come to it.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

GOVERNMENT BILLS AND ORDERS
(Second Reading)

Bill No. 6
The Local Authorities Pension Amendment Act, 1974

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs, Bill No. 6, The Local Authorities Pension Amendment Act, 1974.

The Act, as presented last spring, Mr. Speaker, has been adjusted to provide a deferred pension at age 55. The Act permits retirement at age 55, but the particular section of the Act that defines the deferred pension had restricted it to age 60, so that

we had the anomaly and have presently in the Act the deferred pension which can be realized at age 60 even though the civil servant could retire at age 55.

The purpose of this amendment is to make these two numbers the same so that a person can receive his deferred pension at age 55 and retire also at age 55. For purposes of clarification, a deferred pension occurs when a person terminates his employment with the government or with any kind of employment that is covered by The Local Authorities Pension Act. This amendment would make the practice and the intention of the legislation the same.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, in speaking to Bill No. 6, as indicated in an earlier session, we certainly are in support of the concept that is here. During my time as minister for personnel, I felt that this was one of the very necessary things within the public service, as a concept, specifically because it enabled those who had been long-term employees in the service who wanted possibly to change to other types of employ, to have a different challenge in life, so that they, at that point in time, could retire from the public service, or here the Local Authorities Board, with a respectable income and give them a different move in life.

It also enabled those who really wanted to get out of the service, and provided the possibility and room for advancement and promotion of other people in the service. Certainly those items still hold and we support this legislation again at this time.

[The motion was carried. Bill No. 6 was read a second time.]

Bill No. 7
The Public Service Amendment Act, 1974

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. Provincial Treasurer, Bill No. 7, The Public Service Amendment Act, 1974.

The purpose of this bill is to allow changes in staff establishment to be effected by treasury administrative procedures. It identifies staff establishment control as a function of the process of budget and, consequently, a responsibility of the Department of Treasury. The control function has strengthened since we would have only one department maintaining this particular control over staff establishment which, in prior circumstances, was shared by both the Public Service Commissioner and the office of the Provincial Treasurer.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak to this bill on second reading, I wonder if the hon. minister could explain whether there has been any change in procedure of hiring personnel, whether everything is done through personnel, whether certain categories of employees or staff are hired by the department directly, whether there has been any practice to bypass, in certain instances, the employment of staff through tests or competition through personnel, or whether in some instances the employee or the assistant is hired directly by recommendation from the minister, the Executive Council or the hon. Premier?

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, in making some remarks with regard to Bill No. 7, I certainly would like to have the answer to the question raised by my honourable colleague. But there is one other area that I would like the minister to comment on too, and that is with regard to the concept of decentralized authority or the various departments making decisions with regards to hiring or firing or promotion, et cetera.

As I understand this particular deletion of a section in The Public Service Act, it provides the centralized power, under the treasury department, whereby they will be making the decisions in this particular area of hire. It reverses a trend that was started in the public service whereby various departments or the ministers could make certain decisions at a decentralized level. However, very quickly in examining what the minister has said and examining this section, it potentially provides for greater power at a central level or greater powers for the Provincial Treasurer in administering the Act. I certainly would like to have the minister clarify that particular section.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to make one or two comments. I'm a little concerned about striking out Section 9. It seems to me that by striking this out, Parkinson's Law

is going to have an opportunity to work even better than Parkinson thought. In my experience in departmental work, I found that the staff establishment was always a factor in keeping down the requests for additional staff. The establishment didn't provide for it and so it avoided a lot of applications and a lot of additions to the staff. When we strike out the staff establishment, I'm wondering if this is an invitation for Parkinson's Law to really operate and the civil service to expand and expend.

I would like the hon. minister to advise what control there is now going to be in place of and in lieu of the establishment that previously had some effect in holding down the increase in staff in every department. I would appreciate having the minister's comments on that particular item.

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make a few remarks on this bill and in particular on some changes that are going to be on this bill that are very, very important. I feel that the present government, particularly the Premier and all his supporters, certainly misled the voters of Alberta and in particular those who voted for the Conservative party.

I can recall very well, Mr. Speaker, the Premier and his supporters going all over the province, saying how large a bureaucracy we had and they were going to do something about it. I think the statement went something like this, Alberta had the largest civil service in Canada. Well, if it was true in 1971 that we had the largest in Canada, with the 20 or 30 per cent increase that we have experienced in the last two years, we've got the largest in the world.

I'm just wondering, Mr. Speaker, and I'm sorry that the hon. Premier or even the Deputy Premier aren't in their seats to defend themselves, but this is the opportunity to speak. I have had this in mind, I've had several people in my constituency and throughout the province really concerned with the tremendous increase in staff. I'm not too much opposed to the ordinary civil service staff where the new person comes in and starts at the bottom and works his way up, but we've seen so many political appointments at high salaries that the people are beginning to question it. And I believe that I would like an answer. What does the government plan to do? Apparently it has forgotten about its election promise. Now surely there is no need for a 20 or 30 per cent increase in the civil service staff when you were elected on a platform that you were going to cut down on bureaucracy.

Yesterday, Mr. Speaker, I heard the hon. Minister of Manpower and Labour talking about unemployment in Alberta as the lowest in Canada, and I congratulate him for it. But I am sure there isn't an unemployed Conservative in Alberta, because if he is, he's on the civil service staff. I have had the odd civil servant who has worked for years, and the next thing he knows, he's got somebody planted on top of him. He's promoted sideways. Now, if this is democracy, or if this is open government, or if this is cutting down on bureaucracy, I don't see it. I am as concerned as the hon. Member for Drumheller when he was talking about knocking out Section 9.

I would like to remind the hon. members opposite how they misled the voters, their own voters, those who supported them, because one of their main election platforms was that [they] were going to cut down on bureaucracy. And what has happened? The very opposite has happened. There is certainly no mention of it in any of the Throne speeches since the election. This is a very, very serious thing because we have many people in Alberta who are working, maybe, for just above the minimum wage being taxed to support a huge bureaucracy which is 30 per cent worse at the present time than when the present Premier said it was a terrible condition in 1971.

So I am saying to you, Mr. Speaker - I have every respect for the minister and maybe it isn't his fault. I imagine he has just been told what to do, if he does complain about the high people who are coming into the civil service who haven't been working through the ranks like the ordinary civil servant, but who are, in many cases, political appointments. I believe that we have to have an investigation and something done about it.

MR. SPEAKER:

I don't wish to delay the hon. Member for Edmonton Jasper Place in entering the debate. If hon. members have no objection, I would propose to allow the library staff, with the exception of one person to keep the library open, to leave at 4:00 o'clock this afternoon because of the storm.

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Speaker, there are a couple of observations made by the hon. member who spoke last that perhaps deserve some comment.

I would like to start with his allegation of political appointments and his reference, Mr. Speaker, his very own reference, I have a couple of people in the service. Now, does that not suggest that at some time past, if not present, there were some very close relationships? Does that not suggest that the hon. member, who has been casting allegations, has been doing them from within a glass house which is badly shattered?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

Yes, yes.

MR. YOUNG:

Perhaps since the hon. members would like a bit more, I could furnish them with more.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order.

MR. DIXON:

I would like to ask the hon. member a question ...

[Interjections]

Well, come on, let him answer for himself. Do you want to answer a question?

MR. YOUNG:

When I'm through.

MR. DIXON:

All right, I'll ask it then.

MR. YOUNG:

Since the hon. members have asked for more about political appointments, I would remind them of the chairmanship of the Workers' Compensation Board - an appointment made during the last years of our government. I would also remind them if it was not, in fact, a well-known statesman, an individual who has been well known for his work throughout Alberta and also well known for his political affiliation, which, I am sure the hon. member for Spirit River-Fairview, as well as the honourable gentleman concerned, would deny was that of an affiliation with our particular party. Mr. Jahma certainly couldn't be considered to be a political appointment and of the type that the hon. member, if I interpret him right, is concerned about. Perhaps if the hon. members need yet another reminder we could have reference to an appointment made by this government to the Alberta Liquor Board, an appointment of an executive assistant of the former government, if I remember correctly. Does that bespeak of political appointment of the type that the hon. member rose and shouted about?

[Interjections]

MR. HENDERSON:

I think the hon. member should be aware it's partisan political appointments that are being talked about. Both of those are political appointments, Mr. Speaker.

MR. YOUNG:

I think all appointments to government and government agencies are political appointments but it's the partisan type, as the hon. member rightly suggests the hon. member from Calgary was belabouring.

Mr. Speaker, I think that the hon. member's remarks were totally without foundation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh.

MR. YOUNG:

The hon. member has failed to substantiate his comment with any illustrations at all. In short, he has made a sweeping generalization of the usual type from that location in the House and has been completely unable to substantiate what he has suggested.

Finally, for the hon. member's reference, I would draw to his attention that there was, in fact, an appointment of an ex-minister of the former government to the chairmanship of the Northland School Board, an appointment which, I am sure, cannot by any stretch of the imagination be interpreted as partisan politics. Unless, of course, we consider that he ran a lousy campaign at one time in order to allow our government to get established in the opposition and become a very effective force. I don't think the members would want to go that far.

Mr. Speaker, I hadn't intended to get into this shouting match. I don't consider the remarks worthy of considering ... to be in light of debate that the hon. Member for Calgary Millican brought to our attention. If the hon. member can substantiate what he said, then, perhaps, it bears listening to. Otherwise, I am afraid he has not made a significant contribution to this debate.

MR. DIXON:

I wonder now if I could ask a question of the hon. member. Did not - this is what I am trying to establish and I can establish it if you can't - did not the Conservative platform contain the promise to cut down on bureaucracy and that Alberta had the largest civil service in Canada? What is your answer to that?

MP. SPEAKER:

Would the hon. members please avoid the use of that reprehensible pronoun. I really think that we have reached the stage where we should terminate this unparliamentary practice once and for all.

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Speaker, a very brief answer to the hon. member's question. If he has read the documentation which has been tabled in the House, the answer was clearly contained in those documents. That platform was tabled in the House.

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, while the hon. members on the other side enjoy speaking in generalities, we on this side enjoy speaking in facts. Mr. Speaker, the fact is that since this government has been in office, and I will table this document for the information of all members, the average annual increase in the civil service has been 4.5 per cent. The eight years previous to 1971, the average annual increase was 9.8 per cent.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Shame!

MR. MINIELY:

In fact, Mr. Speaker - no, the hon. members on the other side don't like it but those are the facts - we have, up until September, 1973, cut the size of the growth in the civil service by one-half.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Hear, hear.

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to table this document for the information of all members.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Agreed. They need the help.

MR. LUDWIG:

Will the hon. Provincial Treasurer permit a question? He talks about percentages. Let's talk in actual figures. If we talk ...

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please. If the member has a question, would he come directly to it, please.

MR. LUDWIG:

Yes, Mr. Speaker. Would the hon. Provincial Treasurer present the figures of the growth of the civil service in numbers rather than percentages?

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, the numbers are here and the annual growth rate is here as well. And I will table this for the hon. members.

MR. LUDWIG:

Would the minister permit another question? How much staff, how much of the fat did they cut away since they got into office?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please.

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, I wonder while the hon. the Provincial Treasurer is tabling reports, if he'd table ...

MR. HYNDMAN:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, is the hon. gentleman speaking twice?

[Interjection]

Well, he should preface his comments by asking a question I should think, as a former Speaker of this House.

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct the following question to the Provincial Treasurer. Would he place before this House the names and the number of the people who are working for this government on research projects, and similar types of situations, who are indirectly employed by the government?

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member would put it on the Order Paper, I think we could probably do that. We might also be able to provide the names of people who were indirectly employed by the former government.

MR. FARRAN:

Mr. Speaker, there was one other fact in the hon. member's statements that was incorrect. I won't refer to him by that much-abhorred pronoun. Is "himself", an Irish term, allowed, Mr. Speaker? Well, I am referring, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Member for Calgary Millican and he said that there were Albertans on the minimum wage being taxed to support the civil service, or words to that effect.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the truth is there have been no tax increases since this government assumed office and there have been huge tax reductions amounting to many, many millions of dollars. In the area of property tax alone, the tax reductions and assistance to municipalities to keep down mill rates are in excess of \$100 million. That's performance! That's coffee!

Mr. Speaker, there was another argument put forward by the hon. Member for Calgary Millican which concerned that much used word "patronage". I understand that the members on the other side, Mr. Speaker, are upset because their buddies, who have a vested interest in seeing government programs fail, are not being appointed to sensitive jobs instead of people who have an interest in seeing government programs succeed. Mr. Speaker, there have been many non-partisan appointments, as mentioned by a previous speaker. But it must be one of the cardinal rules of appointing people to important office that they be interested in seeing the program succeed.

This is an activist government and we have ...

MR. LUDWIG:

Would the hon. minister permit a question, Mr. Speaker?

MR. FARRAN:

When I finish, yes.

MR. LUDWIG:

I'm not asking you, I'm asking him.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Sit down.

MR. LUDWIG:

Would the hon. minister permit a question, Mr. Speaker?

MR. FARRAN:

No, Mr. Speaker - in good time.

Mr. Speaker, as I was saying, this is an activist government which has introduced dozens and dozens of new, enlightened, progressive programs since it assumed office in 1971. That it has been able to accomplish this with an annual growth of only 4 per cent in the civil service is almost miraculous. It has not only initiated these enlightened programs but it has made certain that they have been put into action to the point where the decline in population in rural areas has been halted, if not reversed, to the point where ...

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please. There has been some rather exceptional latitude in the debate, both last night and this afternoon. It is perhaps appropriate that in regard to energy and agriculture the Chair should not be too zealous in finding that debate is not relevant to the subject, since they are both broad subjects with many interrelated facts and matters.

But with regard to this particular bill, hon. members may recall that as a result of the introduction of Parkinson's Law into the debate it has roamed very far afield indeed. I would ask hon. members if they might now return, for the remainder of the debate, to discussing the wisdom or otherwise of deleting Section 9 of this particular Act.

MR. FARRAN:

Well, Mr. Speaker, with all respect, the debate did concern the size of the civil service and I was merely referring to the activity of civil servants under this government.

Mr. Speaker, just to emphasize that once more, this government has been spending money without raising taxes, without increasing taxes for the benefit of people ...

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please, I must respectfully ask the hon. member, if he wishes to continue his speech, to deal with the wisdom or otherwise, his opinion in other words, about the deletion of Section 9 of this Act.

MR. FARRAN:

My case rests then, Mr. Speaker.

DR. HOHOL:

May I close the debate?

MR. SPEAKER:

May the hon. minister close the debate?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, I honestly don't know how a peaceable country boy like myself can start all this ruckus. This isn't the first time.

AN HON. MEMBER:

For a country boy you do all right.

AN. HON. MEMBER:

[Inaudible] ... get into trouble.

DR. HOHOL:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I consider everyone on the floor of the House my associate, so I accept the answer.

I think I have only two points to respond to, the others I would guess by random arrangements of responses and answers likely were dealt with.

I would respond to the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View with respect to his question about the system of appointment. There is only one and that is that of the merit system or the merit principle. What is happening in this amendment, should it go through, is the transfer of budgetary control, not that of the system of appointment. The Public Service Commissioner's office will continue to have the responsibility for recruitment, selection, appointment and placement of civil servants.

With respect to the question of the hon. Member for Little Bow who was concerned with the centralization of appointment, I should like to emphasize, sir, that the centralization here is of the control of the establishment in the budget process, not the centralization of the selection of employees.

You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that the budget document identifies for each department the staff establishment when the budget is brought down. The replacement of [Section] 9 is that of the budget process itself, so there is no danger whatsoever in taking out that particular section and relegating the control of the staff establishment, already or priorly identified in the budget document, for accounting and control.

[The motion was carried. Bill No. 7 was read a second time.]

Bill No. 8 The Public Service Pension Amendment Act, 1974

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. Minister of Health and Social Development, Bill No. 8, The Public Service Pension Amendment Act, 1974.

I will simply point out to you, sir, and the members of the House that the amendments in this Act are identical to those of Bill No. 6, The Local Authorities Pension Amendment Act, 1974 the purpose of which is to make the age of retirement and the age of deferred pension, that is 55, to be the same. They appear 55 in the one instance and 60 in the other.

[The motion was carried. Bill no. 8 was read a second time.]

Bill No. 11 The Corrections Amendment Act, 1974

MISS HUNLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. Member for Calgary McKnight, second reading of Bill No. 11, The Corrections Amendment Act, 1974.

Mr. Speaker, while this appears to be a very innocuous bill, not very exciting, I consider it extremely interesting, not only because of what it says, but because of what it makes possible.

This bill is necessary because of the Remand Centre which we so urgently need. With the opening of the Calgary Remand Centre it will be possible to move about 150 people out of the Calgary Correctional Institute, thereby relieving some of the crowded conditions. Following this, we intend to carry out extensive renovations in order to make the best possible use of that facility. Plans are under way to change the west wing of the

institute into an area where inmates will have some measure of privacy. This will allow for a greater degree of classification and separation.

I make no apologies, Mr. Speaker, because I have no high-sounding phrases to offer this Legislature about a blueprint for corrections. Change can and must come, but surely, if it is to be properly considered and developed, it doesn't happen in six short months, at least if it is to be successful.

All over the civilized world governments are struggling with the same problems as we are - how do we keep people out of jails in the first place, but failing that, how do we keep them from returning? And how do we treat them while we have them there?

I spoke last fall of my concern for the first offender. I spoke also of my determination to offer every chance for rehabilitation. So far we have tried a couple of pilot projects, one in Calgary and one in Fort Saskatchewan. In Calgary we took the educational program to the institution. In Fort Saskatchewan we took the inmates out to the community. Both projects were fraught with difficulties, but I believe the concepts are valid and we will be directing our attention to similar programs.

I particularly favour day parole and education and training in the community. Shorter sentences and statutory remissions make it nearly impossible for many inmates to complete their training inside the institutions and it is extremely difficult for them to start again, once outside. I have already met with my colleagues in Manpower and Labour, Education and Advanced Education in order to establish an advisory group to assist us in determining new ways to offer constructive programs. It is my intention to meet regularly with the chief executive officers and to plan with them the most suitable programs for their institutions. I would expect the wardens in turn to discuss this with their staffs and together make the programs work.

The chief executive officers and I have had one very useful meeting. At least I assume that it is a useful meeting and I hope that the result of that meeting hasn't caused a couple of subsequent resignations. I didn't get that impression when we were sitting down informally, I believe for the first time, that they had been gathered together to sit down and discuss mutual concerns with their minister.

I felt that my meeting in the Calgary Correctional Institute in January was also very useful. That meeting was called by me as I felt it was very important for the staff at that institution to learn from their minister first-hand the findings of the Harradence inquiry. I learned a number of important things that night, Mr. Speaker, not the least of which is how many conscientious and concerned individuals we have on staff who are doing their best to carry out an often thankless and always difficult job.

I continue to be shocked by the number of inmates we have in our institutions because of their inability or unwillingness to pay their fines - debtors prisons we have indeed. During 1971, 4,052 were committed to Alberta correctional institutions in default of payment of fines. I do not know at the moment how to solve the problem, but it is high on my priority list and I and others will be seeking alternatives.

I cannot let this opportunity pass to correct some impressions left by the hon. Leader of the Official Opposition. Since I believe him to be a man of honour, I'm sure he did not intend to mislead the House or create a false impression with his references to 200 boys left homeless with the sale of Bowden. I believe the wording was, "200 16- and 17-year-olds" if I'm correct.

MR. LUDWIG:

A point of order, I believe that the hon. minister is rebutting a remark made by the hon. Leader of the Opposition during the Speech from the Throne [debate]. I think if she wanted to get into that she should have, but that is a matter - she's referring to the Speech from the Throne ...

AN HON. MEMBER:

Order, order.

MR. LUDWIG:

... and she has no business doing that according to the rules of this House, Mr. Speaker.

[Laughter]

The donkeys laugh loudest who know most, Mr. Speaker, but that's a proper valid objection. I'd like your ruling, never mind the hee-haw from the Deputy Premier.

AN HCN. MEMBER:

We're all donkeys.

MR. SPEAKER:

As I understand the hon. member, he is saying in effect that something referred to in the debate on the Speech from the Throne may not be referred to again in the Assembly. That is going too far. If there is anything objectionable in what the hon. minister is now saying in rebuttal to what the hon. minister alleges the hon. Leader of the Opposition to have said, I'm unaware of any rule which would say that that was out of order.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, perhaps I didn't state my point of order properly, but I'm of the opinion that the rules of the House are that you cannot refer in one debate to something that was said or done in another debate, because if we did this, we will be debating all debates before this House at all times. I believe that is a cardinal rule in this House, and that your ruling, Mr. Speaker, will then allow me to debate with anything anybody said on any debate. That's the way I read your interpretation. I'm objecting ... in this debate I can raise any issue, according to your ruling, on any debate which was conducted in this House in this session. I believe that that is not allowed.

DR. HORNFR:

Mr. Speaker, if I could speak to the point of order, which I don't feel is a point of order at all. The hon. member is now saying that anything covered in a Throne Speech debate or a budget debate then cannot be dealt with on the principle of a very important bill. That's sheer nonsense. The hon. minister is talking about a bill before this Legislature and we're dealing with the principle of that bill. Surely, unless the hon. member wants to apply closure, not being able to talk at all in this Legislature with regard to what they have said ... I know that sometimes they say things inadvertently and don't want them brought up again, but that surely shouldn't be part of the rules to protect them from that.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, in reply to that point of order, I believe my point of order may not have been very clear and may have confused the hon. Deputy Premier, but I couldn't have confused him so badly with such a short point of order. He must have been that way before I started.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please.

Order please. Without at the moment wishing to establish any precedent in the matter, I will give the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View an opportunity to see whether there is authority to support his opinion. I would say that the hon. minister, insofar as the point of order is concerned, is entitled to proceed to deal with that particular item.

However, I have another misgiving in regard to it and that is on the ground of relevance. My concern is whether, if we are going to have bills coming into the House dealing with matters such as, at the moment, corrections, are we going to have a debate on corrections generally from A to Z, or are we going to be obliged to confine the debate to the actual subject matter of the bill?

My unsupported recollection is that the custom of the House has been to use this kind of amendment as a basis for a general discussion of the topic covered by the main bill which is being amended. Now that may be wrong, and it perhaps is something which should be given further consideration.

MISS HUNLEY:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I proceed to develop my argument and my comments, sir, I think you will find that they are relevant to corrections, because we're referring to the development of detention centres and remand centres. I hope that you will find them acceptable.

The wording I referred to when I was so rudely interrupted is that it says, "You know where the 200 16- and 17-year old young men who are in institutions in this province. ..." I think that it's timely for me to correct some false impressions, if indeed the

impression is prevalent that Bowden is the only place in which we have 16 and 17 year olds.

The truth of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that Bowden has never held 200 people. Our inmate space is nearly 175. We could get up to 200 but it would be very difficult. We have never had Bowden completely filled. There have never been sufficient suitable "candidates", if I can use that word, to adequately fill Bowden for the staff that was on strength there.

A review of the statistics is quite interesting. The high in Bowden was in August, 1968 when we had 160 people altogether. The low of inmate population was in November of 1972 when there were only 68. We have all ages from age 16 to age 54, but in all fairness, Mr. Speaker, the greater numbers are in the younger age groups.

But Bowden is not the only correctional institution which confines young offenders and a review of the statistics is quite interesting. I've broken them down into how many there are in Bowden and how many there are in the other four institutions in Alberta, that is the Calgary Correctional Institute, Fort Saskatchewan Correctional Institute, Peace River and Lethbridge.

During 1968 and 1969 in the four institutions we had: inmates 16 years of age, 257 - in Bowden there were 46; inmates aged 17, in the four others there were 435 - in Bowden there were 48; inmates aged 18, 594 - in Bowden there were 62. In 1969 and 1970: aged 16, 307 - in Bowden, 48; aged 17, 402 - in Bowden, 62; aged 18, 599 - in Bowden we had 50. And so it goes and the pattern is similar. I have the intervening years, but they are so similar, I can read them if anyone is interested. In 1972-1973, in Fort Saskatchewan, Calgary, Peace River and Lethbridge there were: aged 16, 325 - in Bowden 43; aged 17, in the four others, 425 - in Bowden, 50; aged 18, in the four other correctional institutes, 480 - in Bowden, 37.

In dealing with these statistics, Mr. Speaker, I have omitted those relating to inmates over 18 since they are fewer in number. I might add that we have inmates of varying ages. As a matter of fact, we had in Bowden a couple of "boys" in the age bracket of 50 to 54.

In every category, since 1967 to 1968, the number of inmates starts to drop after age 19. When I reviewed those statistics I was quite shocked and surprised. As a matter of fact, our jail population has been decreasing steadily since 1969.

The average number of 16 year olds in Bowden since 1967 is 47.5; 17 year olds, 52; 18 year olds, 50. The average number in other institutions is: 16 year olds, 327.7; 17 year olds, 454.7; 18 year olds, 569.7.

Mr. Speaker, while I do not treat lightly the incarceration of anyone, particularly those whose sentences and subsequent attitudes lend themselves to minimum security institutions, I believe there are more effective ways of dealing with this situation than by maintaining a large and expensive institution. Smaller institutions, more readily accessible to training units and employment for those on day parole are, in my view, a much more desirable alternative. Granted it would have been a desirable arrangement to have this alternative ready and have it in operation, but time has not yet permitted it.

Since assuming office I have met informally with most of the probation officers. Once again, I was impressed with the enthusiasm and interest of those in this section of the department. Since it is, in my opinion, very desirable that the jail population be decreased rather than increased, the probation officers are and will continue to be a very important segment of my staff.

I am anxious to offer my staff the advantages of training and retraining and the opportunity to upgrade their skills, in order that they may fulfill their own ambitions as well as work more capably with this troubled area of society.

Perhaps the hon. members are unaware that to date a Deputy Solicitor General has not been appointed. While there have been a number of interesting applicants, no final decisions have been reached and we are continuing interviews. I consider this appointment to be one of the most important decisions I will make during my term of office. Despite my anxiety to make this appointment and the great need that exists for a deputy, I intend to continue the search until I am satisfied we have recruited the best possible person.

Change can and must come. It will not be anything earth-shattering or dramatic. For the present we are locked into the type of facility which exists, therefore, we are programming according to what we have. Future developments and facilities however, will be designed according to the type of rehabilitative programs we believe will be effective.

I see us slowly, but surely, turning around the existing system of corrections in Alberta. Never will we be without our hard core criminals who will be our steady inmates. If we believe otherwise, we deceive ourselves. But even to those, I would like to offer hope and opportunity if they wish to take advantage of it.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, in speaking to the principle of Bill No. 11, I appreciate the latitude that you extended to the minister. I trust that the same latitude will be extended to me in dealing with some of the matters raised. I still say that the hon. minister perhaps had that speech prepared and written out for the Speech from the Throne [debate], but in fumbling once in a while they sometimes outsmart themselves.

Her defence of the sale of the Bowden Institute was certainly necessary and I am pleased that she did not say that that institution was not necessary. There is a place, there is a need for keeping young offenders, first offenders and first young offenders and minor offenders away from the hardened core or the repeater or the tougher type of criminal. She recognizes that and I am sure that the hon. minister is sincere and that she will do something about it, even though she admits they will turn slowly but surely, change will come about. I hope that we can do something to expedite this rather slow change, because although changes will come slowly the crime rate and the stress on facilities is growing rather rapidly.

With the remand centre in Calgary I am confident that it will be a tremendous advancement for the handling of young prisoners and other prisoners, and that it is a step in the right direction. With all due respect to our much-travelled mayor, we tried to expedite the construction of this building and in 1970 I got pretty well worked over by His Worship for not having finished it, but four years later we are still trying hard to open the place. I believe that we will open it finally, although they have adjourned the opening more often than an improvident law suit is adjourned sometimes. But eventually something will happen. I hope that we can open it by June - it is no reflection on the present Solicitor General that there has been a delay, Mr. Speaker. I'll grant her that much.

When we talk about the sale of Bowden and how many young prisoners are held in other prisons, that is not a justification for backtracking. If the hon. Solicitor General gets up and will say that that institution was of no benefit so we sold it, then I'll have to take it from there. But she didn't say so. She just said we sold it and there were prisoners in other prisons, young prisoners. Well let's do something about it and let's not let this continue. For everybody is of the opinion that it is not in the public interest to have young offenders confined with more serious hardened criminals.

I'm not saying that it's the fault of this present government, but almost three years later we want to feel that they're not just going to say, well you didn't do something, and you couldn't have done so well otherwise we'd be home free.

These problems are ongoing problems. They keep getting worse with the acceleration of crime. The cities are growing bigger. You mustn't treat this as something that because we didn't provide you with good facilities and everything for the next 20 years, you can sit pat and say, well it was your baby.

There are many things we didn't know three years ago that the hon. Solicitor General ought to know today and move with it, Mr. Speaker. There are new things being found out every day. We are learning from experience that we have to move rather quickly. I'm sure that the hon. members here will support a budget for the Solicitor General.

The hon. Solicitor General refers to her concern about young people who couldn't pay fines. There are many of them and I've been in court when they couldn't. It is a concern to everybody. I don't know what the answer is; perhaps it's a social problem. Perhaps, as I stated, things are good in this province but not so good for everybody. Some people can't buy meals and some people can't pay fines. It's not necessarily the government's responsibility. But it's a problem that we have to look at.

Now talking about fines, I'm concerned about an inequity that continues in this province and has continued for many years. It is not something the Conservatives invented because they invented only the good things. But I can't understand why penalties in Edmonton for impaired driving and failure to take the breathalyser test ought to be continually - there are exceptions - lower than in Calgary.

I know that there must be some explanation. Maybe it's a different world, legal world or judicial world, Mr. Speaker, but there's no justification for a practice of fining impaired drivers in Calgary \$250, \$300 and higher and here the pay-off, the tab is \$150. There's some shortcoming in the system. I think that since we had male Attorney Generals who couldn't get it done maybe a lady Solicitor General can do something about it. But it isn't fair. It appears to me that the right thing to do for a person charged in Calgary with impaired driving is to have it waived to Edmonton and plead guilty here. It's cheaper. You can even make the trip for less than \$100. This is an inequity and many

people are commenting on it. Maybe somebody ought to tell the magistrates or provincial judges that this is hard for the layman to understand.

This does happen sometimes. People who can, will waive impaired driving charges out of Calgary to get out of there. I'm not saying they're tough in Calgary. I think that an impaired driver who didn't care whether he killed somebody or damaged or injured somebody, ought to be rapped, but I don't see why there's a special dispensation for this kind of situation in Edmonton. I believe that between the hon. the Attorney General and the Solicitor General they ought to come up with an answer.

In the corrections field I'm quite convinced the hon. Solicitor General is sincere, but I'm also thinking that she can't mark time and wait to get a deputy. There is a good supply, a good number of people who would take that job and who are competent, especially in this case. If you are going to have reform and it is going to take you six months or a year to get a deputy, it's going to take you too long to get anything moving. After all you have to break in the deputy if you get one.

With regard to the hire of wardens I think if a government can't move quickly and efficiently in this manner and so that we let the deputy wardens be in control then we are also not quite as reform-oriented as we'd like to believe we are. We have to get cracking with some of these things, not just talk about them. It's all right to say, oh yes the wheels of justice turn slowly. The administration reform and the implementation of these things is not entirely something you can go on and on and treat indifferently. You have to ...

MR. GHITTER:

I wonder if the hon. member would permit a question?

MR. LUDWIG:

Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. GHITTER:

I am wondering if the hon. member, when he discusses the difficulty in obtaining wardens, has regarded his irresponsible comments about Warden Jackson to be of any assistance to the Solicitor General in obtaining people in that regard?

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I think that remark ought to be treated like a lot of other remarks the hon. member has made. It's his opinion whether my remarks about Jackson were responsible. I'm of the opinion that the whole hearing and the tampering with Jackson's testimony was irresponsible. That's my opinion and I am entitled to it. If the hon. member wishes to read the evidence that I have in my possession, I'll read it on title and preamble. Then let him judge. His opinion is that my remarks concerning Jackson were irresponsible. Many people were making remarks about Jackson which they were entitled to make and he is entitled to say this. But I am saying that I was in the Legislature in the last session, when I stated that if Jackson loses his job as a result of this fumble by somebody in either the A.G.'s department or the Solicitor General's department, this government will hear about it.

Surely Mr. Jackson is no longer employed at the Calgary Correctional Institute at Spy Hill, although he made the government look fairly good by resigning. But let's not get into that because the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo likes to use the words irresponsible remarks. When I made them he should have stood up and been courted and made particular reference to them. The correctional institution problems are not so much what I say that he doesn't agree with, it's what I say that the minister has to do or says she is doing but she isn't doing. We can't just sort of stand there, Mr. Speaker, and spin our wheels indefinitely. We are going to urge the hon. minister to get the wardens selected. If they are not paying them enough, I don't believe this government can plead poverty. It's about time they adjusted the salary level of wardens and guards to where they will attract the kind of people they ought to have.

When we talk about irresponsibility - I wrote a letter to the Attorney General about the fact that there was a gang rape in Spy Hill in the beginning of 1973 and warned him that this was the situation. He should have known because other people told him. The media told him. His staff maybe didn't tell him. I don't think they told the hon. Attorney General everything because he didn't seem to know. So I wrote him that letter and it was, I think, to the point, that he had been warned about conditions there. After that Warden Jackson demanded more staff. And after that, not too long ago, there was another attack by a man on a young prisoner. So maybe we should feel that this is proper discharge of responsibilities and if I raise this in the House then I am being irresponsible.

I am saying that I'm not being irresponsible. Some of the people whose young sons get into Calgary Correctional Institute at Spy Hill must be terribly perturbed about the fact that for a minor crime - maybe minor theft, or a drinking or driving offence - a 16 year old can end up in the correctional institute and be sexually violated.

There has been nothing done by this government to at least safeguard the prisoners more than they were a year ago. They are talking that they are going to do this and they are going to do that. But as I stated, a lot of people, especially those people whose children may get into trouble, are paying for the institution that we provide. We at least should be very concerned and be responsible to see their rights are not violated. I am not saying that the hon. Solicitor General can ensure against all eventualities, but it would be sufficient if we were satisfied that what can be done is being done. Right now, Mr. Speaker, I am not satisfied that anything is being done because the warden, a very reputable and responsible man who did the best he could, resigned. And the hon. Solicitor General stands up in the House and says that she is not sure what came in the late mail, maybe we will find somebody.

I am saying that if somebody wanted to find a warden and pay him properly and get a properly qualified man, we could find one quickly and not wait until the session is over. I am saying that a good way to start, when you have difficulty filling the most responsible positions, is to raise the salary so that it will attract people who perhaps can do the job.

While we are talking about Warden Jackson, I have not talked to him since he stepped down from his position. Nor did I talk with him while the inquiry was on. I didn't want to because he, as it were, appeared to be on trial. I know very well that the minister admitted that she had talked to some of the people on the board of inquiry. It is evident to me - I don't know whether I should raise it now because I will raise it again, Mr. Speaker - that somebody in Edmonton, in the Solicitor General's ... in the correction area had spoken to Jackson. I'll bring that evidence in later and read it in and table it. In my humble opinion someone tried to get to him. Now you might say that isn't so. It's my opinion and there are sufficient statements made by solicitors and by the press and by Warden Jackson to that effect.

I wish to make one more statement that I think has not been so responsibly discharged. It's the responsibility of the opposition not to criticize the minister for what she does or criticize her personally, but it is our responsibility to push them to get those things done which they know need to be done. It's different if the hon. Solicitor General didn't know what the problem is, but she does know. And the Attorney General knows and the government knows and they knew a long time ago. They are sitting today and saying, well, something will happen. Something will turn up, if nothing more than our toes.

I feel it is my responsibility to urge the hon. Solicitor General to move as quickly and as expeditiously as possible to solve this problem. As I stated, nobody expects these things. We are dealing with human beings and unpredictable situations - some of them perfectly - but we will be satisfied if the best that can be done has been done. I am saying that to date it has not been.

One more item that I must now raise, seeing as we got into a debate on corrections, is the question of that inquiry, Mr. Speaker. I am not satisfied now that if they did make a report to the Solicitor General that we have not had explained to us what were the specific recommendations and whether she is going to implement them or not. We spent a lot of money. I am saying that that inquiry was necessary, in my opinion. I am not satisfied that it was a sort of completely arm's-length kind of inquiry because of communications between witnesses who were not brought before the inquiry. It is up to us to treat this seriously. When there is an inquiry nobody shall tamper with witnesses, and if he does he should be called before the inquiry and not have a meeting behind closed doors and say, well, we are satisfied, it's all right. I'm not satisfied that I know what went on. If we don't know what went on why have an inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

I think the Solicitor General will acquit herself most admirably and to my satisfaction if she can stand up and say that everything that is possible under the circumstances is being done. I am not satisfied that it is. I trust that when we go into reform in the correctional field that we will heed some of the reports and recommendations made in the past and act on them now that we have had time to study. We apparently know much more about the problems that confront us today than we have at any time in the past.

Furthermore, this present government has perhaps as great a majority of professional people who are as experienced in this field as any and it behooves them to do what they can to launch the next period of reform expeditiously and properly or point in the right direction. There are always excuses that we can't get staff. That hardly holds water now, Mr. Speaker. They have the money. They have the know-how. They have the professional staff hired. They have professional people in their government who can give guidelines, experienced and capable people. The excuse is harder to take because of all these facilities, all the money, all the know-how. Don't let anybody tell me that the

public is satisfied that we have done the best we can. If we have then I would like to be shown.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take the opportunity under Bill 11, The Corrections Amendment Act, to make a few comments regarding our correctional system in Alberta. I would not want my remarks to be regarded as criticism of the present Solicitor General because I feel many of the problems that do exist in this department are problems that arose prior to the Solicitor General assuming the department. She has, in fact, inherited some problems. My comments, I would hope, would be taken in the form of constructive suggestions for improvement.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that there is a morale problem within the corrections department. This is caused by perhaps several things. It seems there has been a woeful lack of promotions within the corrections branch to higher positions within the civil service. For example, it is my understanding that we have never had a warden promoted past that position. And this certainly must create consternation in the minds of eager, keen, loyal employees in that branch.

Further, Mr. Speaker, there is some evidence that the pay scales are not competitive. Also, Mr. Speaker, delays in the filling of posts in this department add an extra load on those who have to carry on, and have a demoralizing effect.

It also seems, Mr. Speaker, that not always do we fully appreciate the role and the workload that we impose upon the correction staff, because we sometimes forget that they are bombarded by criticism from every side at the best of times. It seems that they certainly are tested to the maximum by the inmates. There are well-meaning, often very vocal reformers who test their patience. There are just plain do-gooders, and often the general public does not fully appreciate the role that the correction staff has to play.

But what is even more serious, there seems to be prevalent within the corrections department a feeling of lack of support from higher echelons within the department. And here it seems that that feeling emanates from the positions between wardens to the minister. It seems that there are some problems in this area, Mr. Speaker, and hopefully the Solicitor General will be able to find the problem areas and have them corrected, and done quickly, to prevent any further resignations of very capable people in this department.

As for Warden Jackson, Mr. Speaker, I have had the pleasure of knowing him for several years. I regard him as a very highly respected and competent individual and I think it is a very sad situation that circumstances existed which he felt forced him to leave the department. Warden Jackson pioneered many improvements in the correction field and was well respected in the community. I might add that the community surrounding the institution on the outskirts of Calgary, the residents in that community, regarded him with very high esteem. It is no simple feat, Mr. Speaker, to be the warden of a penal institution and be highly regarded by the residents in the farms around such an institution.

So, Mr. Speaker, although I certainly lament the loss of Warden Jackson from the correction staff, I would say that we must conscientiously strive to correct those situations which forced him, and others, to resign from the staff, and that prudent dispatch at this time would certainly go a long way towards rebuilding the morale in the corrections department and prevent the loss of other very capable individuals.

MR. GHITTER:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a few remarks relating to some of the comments that have been made. I will be brief but I do wish to talk in terms of how unfortunate it is, in my judgment, that a man of the calibre of Warden Jackson deems it necessary to resign from the position that he held.

In talking in terms of the validity of correctional difficulties and how to overcome them, I think that Warden Jackson was very innovative in many of the things he did at the Spy Hill jail. Many of the inmates, young people, were allowed day parole programs at the Spy Hill jail from the point of view of bringing inmates back into the streets while they were serving periods of imprisonment. Trying to bring them back into the mainstream of life and the attitude of Warden Jackson in perpetuating these programs was such that it was a forerunner for many other programs I think this government should be embarking upon on a more serious basis.

I think really the unfortunate aspect of matters surrounding the jail, the hearings and matters of that nature was that political interference, political communication, political suggestions on Main Street were such that it placed Warden Jackson in an almost

untenable position where he is dealing in such a sensitized area as incarceration of individuals, and the great difficulties that Warden Jackson faced when certain - I said it before and I will say it again - irresponsible members will take a situation like that which is so sensitive and try to utilize it and manipulate it for political purposes.

I think that type of pressure and that kind of difficulty presents a very difficult problem from the point of view of a Solicitor General who is endeavouring to find individuals who will come into the situation and assume the very serious responsibilities of wardens in the correctional institutions. I think that it is not the place for members of this Assembly to rise, while a commission appointed by this government is actually in progress and start criticizing a warden when he knows that there are difficulties within that institution.

I think it is regrettable that this province is losing the service of a man who had the far-reaching attitudes Warden Jackson had and I regret his leaving us. But I would only suggest that my comments relating to irresponsibility of criticism of Warden Jackson at that time certainly did nothing to assist the situation and really only hampered it, and restricted the viability and the necessary matters that must be dealt with by the Solicitor General in obtaining appointments.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I believe that the hon. member made some reflection as to MLAs criticizing the warden. I think that he has cast a reflection perhaps on several members, and perhaps if he feels that someone unduly criticized Warden Jackson anywhere in the House or elsewhere, that he should use a name, rather than be general. Because so far as I can recall, no hon. members on this side criticized Jackson. They supported him whole-heartedly and the problem here was that he apparently didn't have any support on the other side. That is the position I take. To cast a reflection, he may as well have used ...

[Interjections]

MR. GHITTER:

So there is no misunderstanding, Mr. Speaker, from the point of view of the other responsible members of the House. I think the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View well knows who I'm speaking of from the point of view of comments he made relating to Warden Jackson while the Harradence Commission was in session.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, further to the point of order I never believe that any kind of commission appointed by a Conservative government is a sacred cow and I will criticize him if I feel like it, whether the hon. member feels I should or not, and nobody like him is going to gag me or anybody else.

MR. SPEAKER:

We have not really a genuine point of order. We should perhaps resume the debate.

MR. STROM:

Mr. Speaker, I really hadn't intended to get into the debate on Bill No. 11, but there are some points I would like to make and I would say at the outset that they will not relate in any way to Warden Jackson as a personality. I have never met him. I do not know the man, although I can say that I would have the greatest sympathy for the position he finds himself in. I say this generally, not as an individual in a specific spot, but rather as a individual at a specific point in time in our history in trying to carry out justice as he sees it.

If I were to sum it up in a simple sentence, I would say that my greatest concern is the erosion of respect for law and order. And I don't think there is a single one of us sitting in the House, Mr. Speaker, who has not at some time or other had this thought go through his mind as to what it is that is actually happening within our society today which is creating the kind of situations we are trying to cope with as legislators at this point in time.

I was very interested in visiting with a very good friend of mine who happens to be dealing with a public institution, that is a motel within our city. This man has been in the business for years and years, and one of the problems he has to cope with is the fact that today, instead of individuals being prepared to accept law and order, or the discipline of law and order, he is now faced with having to guard himself against the possibility of being charged with assault if he tries to correct someone who is carrying on in a manner that is not in accordance with the standards accepted by our society today.

I was a little amused, also a little saddened, when I heard the method that he used to cope with it. He told me, that instead of now trying to deal with it as a person to a person, he has hired himself a dog which is trained to guard yards at night, and also to take care of situations that individuals can't cope with. He said it is rather interesting that when he goes to the door of a motel to discipline someone who is being disorderly, they do not look at him, but they look at the dog, and they say, "Thank you sir, I will do as you say."

It is a sad commentary on society, Mr. Speaker, when we have lowered ourselves to the position that the only kind of respect we can understand is not the respect related between individuals, but rather the brute force of an animal that they cannot bring into court and sue.

I want to make it very clear, Mr. Speaker, that as far as I am concerned I in no way want to be critical of the work that our Solicitor General is doing at this time. I do not understand it, and I do not profess to, and maybe for that reason I will not be able to get into it as other members of the Legislature will be able to do. But I would simply say that I have a great appreciation for the problems that she will be facing simply because of the total problem that we are facing within society today.

I am convinced that what we are really doing is trying to bring in stop-gap measures to solve a problem that has its roots at another place in society altogether. I do not know whether the hon. members will agree with me, but I am convinced that this is so. I am disturbed because I feel that we are pressing to the limit this matter of rights of individuals, whether they be criminals or whether they be anybody else. With this overemphasis on rights, we are neglecting to point out that there are some responsibilities that individuals have within society.

It is my sincere hope that as legislators we will use our influence to try to cope with it in the limited way that is afforded to each one of us. I would suggest that the conduct of adults, the permissiveness of society that we are entering into at this particular point in time, the influence of magazine, pornography, TV, movies, the lack of support for law enforcement as it presently exists has a much greater influence on the problem that the hon. Solicitor General is facing in the correctional institutions today than the fault of a warden, the fault of something within the system itself. It has a deeper root than that.

I was disturbed, for example, to hear that on TV last night - I didn't see it myself - but I was told that the TV program showed at length these streakers who are performing, if I can use that word, within our society. It was a young girl who told my 14 year old daughter that she had watched it, and she said, "Arlene, you know, they kept it on for a long time too. A front view." Is this necessary? I say if we are going to press the matter of freedoms to the limit, yes, I suppose we'll have to allow it. But how long is it going to be before we are prepared to stand up and be counted on these matters? I say it's about time that we give very serious consideration to it.

Mr. Speaker, I realize that we do have to have stop-gap measures, and for that reason I suppose that the measures as introduced by Bill No. 11 and proposed in there are necessary. But I hope that every MLA within this Legislature will recognize that the problem is much more deep-rooted and it will require some consideration on the part of each one of us to do our part to ensure that there is continuing respect for law and order if we are going to survive as a society.

Thank you.

MR. LEE:

Mr. Speaker, before presenting some observations on this bill, I would like to present an observation of my own. I'm sure I share with many of the members of this House a real respect for the manner in which the Solicitor General has undertaken the responsibilities of her department. I am sure I am one of all members of the House inspired last session by her address upon her undertaking of the responsibilities of this office and I am certainly impressed by the approach that she has taken in directly tackling her responsibilities in this area. We are all sure that she will develop a blueprint for corrections in short order which will develop within this province.

I must say though that I don't express or share the same confidence when I hear certain observations from the other side. It's encouraging, in fact, to note that the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View has learned enough to intervene today, but I do have a real concern when I've heard expressions of the hon. Leader of the Opposition in his comments on institutions. They reflect, I think, an approach to corrections which we've got to change and that is the approach that there should be an emphasis on custodial care and incarceration, and very often leaving in the background certain considerations relating to rehabilitation. When we talk about Bowden, and we talk about other jails, I'm not so sure that they just wouldn't build the walls bigger, thicker and higher and leave such areas as rehabilitation.

I want to, though, make a few personal observations about this area of corrections. In doing so, I want to state the premise that corrections must involve more than just incarceration and custody. In looking at some of the reasons for incarceration, I think we can move with this kind of premise. When we look at incarceration traditionally, I guess - and we're going to be saddled with this kind of approach for some time to come - it involves a punishment, and in some cases, a revenge for a particular breaking of the law, a particular act.

Perhaps more compelling reasons for incarceration are four. One of these is the public protection - protection of the public from an offender and the act that he may perpetuate.

A second reason for incarceration is a personal deterrent - a deterrent, a punishment upon that particular offender, on the assumption that by incarceration he or she will not continue that particular act.

A third reason for incarceration is that it serves, perhaps, as a societal deterrent, that by making an example of one offender in society, other potential offenders will not carry out this kind of act.

I guess the reason for incarceration I want to speak more about, very often is one of rehabilitation, to provide a treatment, a rehabilitation that could not be undertaken without incarceration.

But I want to express this feeling, that when we look at incarceration, placing people in institutions, we should develop more of an emphasis on punishment, on revenge, than we must on a manpower development kind of approach. It's an area that, when we were looking through the Task Force on Manpower Training and Retraining, we were struck by the similarity in the various conditions that we find between what we term various disadvantaged groups within our population - disadvantages that they find themselves in, in manpower development and developing their own capabilities.

It was interesting to note that those people who find themselves in prisons have very much the same kinds of problems that many people out in society have in disadvantaged conditions - many of the aged, many women on welfare, many of the handicapped, certain ethnic and immigrant groups - that whole kind of grey area that we term the hard-core unemployed.

Now we found that they do have certain things in common. Most of these groups, including the imprisoned, have certain social and family difficulties which have followed them very often through their lives and into imprisonment. They face, upon looking for employment, upon looking for training, certain societal prejudices.

In case of the imprisoned, prejudice perhaps related to their original offensive act, but in the case of other disadvantaged groups, for other reasons. They face very often a history of financial difficulty and a difficulty in dealing with their own financial concerns. They've had difficulties determining and developing a job or career emphasis to their life. They have had difficulty developing a level of training in which they can enter the work force, enter society. They have difficulty getting access to training and they have certain personal and emotional difficulties which hamper them in all of these interventions.

I stress again that these are not concerns that are just unique to those people who find themselves in prison, they are perhaps unique to what we call this whole area of the disadvantaged. It is interesting that many people we would find in prison are not unlike many of the hard-core unemployed in the very difficulties they face.

It is interesting. Last year I was reading a book called, The Prison of the Unemployed. In it they made a statement about what they called, the sorting process that occurs in crime and occurs in relation to incarceration. They made this statement, "that less than one-half of the offences" - and this is in the United States, but I am sure it would reflect back to Canada - "less than one-half of the offences that do occur are reported. Of this group, less than one-fifth of these people are actually arrested. Of the group that remains less than three-quarters of these are convicted. Of these that remain, less than one-third are placed in correctional institutes." So just taking a sample of 100 crimes committed, 50 might be reported, 12 arrested, 6 lead to conviction and 2 of these would remain in jail.

So when we look at a sorting kind of process, and we look at criminal action, we look at the deviant action within our society, I think we realize that we are not just dealing with the people who are in the prisons. We're dealing with a larger societal problem which is reflected with individuals in society and in prisons themselves. So we have to deal with it not just as a 'ghettoized' group that finds itself in prison, we have to deal with this whole area of the disadvantaged population.

Now in saying this then, I guess I would contend that it is not unreasonable to take a manpower development, in this case a manpower-rehabilitation position, when we look at corrections. Just as with the other disadvantaged groups that I mentioned, it's compelling that we undertake this kind of approach not only from a humanitarian point of view which is expressed so well by our Solicitor General, but also from a very practical point of view.

We often hear lots of statistics relating to what we can do if we take somebody off welfare, how much it saves us. But let's look at what it costs us to keep a person in prison. I've heard the figure of approximately \$4,000 as compared to \$1,000 rehabilitating the same person through some process of probation and parole. But the fact remains that we do have to satisfy ourselves as a society regarding certain considerations on incarceration, protection of the public, the deterrent kinds of factors. But recognizing these, there are still steps, there are still stages that I contend we can take in rehabilitation that we are not taking right now in this manpower-development approach.

I want to just quickly mention five of these for the consideration of this Assembly and for the consideration of the Solicitor General.

The first of these is, I contend that we can take a rehabilitation consideration at all of the stages of the correctional process. I think it is especially important when I listen to the statistics that the Solicitor General has quoted today regarding the kinds of people we find in our institutes these days - people there because of debt - many of the very young, many who certainly can't be called hard-core criminals. I'm saying that at the first stage of the correctional process - arrest and trial - we have a lot of alternatives open to us other than incarceration. These are undertaken - custody of the individual placed [with] an individual in society and use of the suspended sentence and probation. When we look at probation I would just quote a statement about probation. Probation isn't just the soft handling of the offender.

It is the postponement of a final judgment or sentence in a criminal case giving the offender an opportunity to improve his conduct and readjust himself to the community often on the conditions imposed by the court, and under the guidance and supervision of an officer. It is not a method of applying leniency in any given case, nor is it for the offender who is not likely to become a criminal.

I'm saying that probation is undertaken with the whole idea of protecting society and as a deterrent. It can perhaps be used more often as a method of correction.

We can use such ideas as the suspended sentence as I mentioned - treatment kinds of considerations. For instance, with certain alcoholic cases we have already undertaken a treatment emphasis rather than an incarceration emphasis.

Let's look at the second stage though. I'm saying there are a lot of rehabilitative things we can do, that can occur even in the act of incarceration, and we are undertaking these. I guess I'm suggesting that we can extend them. Things like day passes, day paroles, work releases, educational leave, training-on-the-job kinds of releases, and the use, as the Solicitor General has mentioned, of smaller institutions rather than large institutions to detain offenders.

The third stage we can look at, and once again examine the rehabilitative process there, is parole. Parole is recognized as a major step in rehabilitation. But we need an infrastructure too to go along with parole. We need the use of halfway houses, we need homes in which individuals can be placed under a custodial kind of care. We need detention kinds of centres.

Finally, the fourth stage, there are a lot of things we can do even upon release itself - post-assistance kinds of counselling, post-assistance kinds of social work assistance, placement, financial assistance, things which are provided now through such societies as the John Howard Society and Elizabeth Fry [Society]. Perhaps we can work more closely with them in providing these kinds of services.

These things all occur right now, but my suggestion is that they must occur as part of a more integrated, a more conscious rehabilitative emphasis.

A second consideration that I want to present, a second observation, is that we have to apply a wider range of integrated services for the offender both inside and outside the correctional institution. Custody is only one part. As I have suggested, we have to add to custody such services, such kinds of capabilities as career planning, placement, academic upgrading, income maintenance and financial assistance, training and work-experience kinds of activities, assistance in social and work orientation once the individual leaves custody, family and personal social work assistance, lodging, transportation, counselling and very often psychotherapy to help these individuals. Once again, these things are present, but I'm suggesting they are present in a sporadic kind of way not in the more total way that we have to provide for this kind of manpower resource.

A third consideration is one that I think is very important. It's one that was reflected and I'd like to quote from the Harradence Inquiry Report, and that is:

There is a need for community support involvement and integration, an obvious marshalling of the resources that we have in our communities to assist in the development of this manpower resource.

I quote from the Harradence Report in their comment regarding what they have recognized, or what they feel is the incompatibility of rehabilitation and custody, and I quote:

That the objectives of the concept of rehabilitation cannot be met within the custodial environment. All that can be hoped for in the custodial environment is that the inmate can be taught to live in that environment. It is rehabilitation which teaches him to live in society.

And following:

With respect to the concept of rehabilitation outside of the custodial environment, the Commission respectfully suggests that the Provincial Government give serious consideration to the establishment of facilities similar to the very promising Grierson Project of the Canadian Penitentiary Service.

The suggestion is made here, and the suggestion is not unlike one that is found in the manpower report of the President of the United States. And I quote briefly from this. The President, in 1970, appointed a task force on prisoner rehabilitation, and I quote:

... The essence of this report was that correctional reform, to succeed, must obtain the support of the community Satisfying work experience for institutionalized offenders, including vocational and prevocational training when needed, and the assurance of decent jobs for released offenders, have to be at the heart of the correctional process ...

I concur with this contention that we have to marshal the resources within our community, not just treat the problem within the institution and then outside the institution and have the two separated completely.

In order to do this, I guess I am suggesting a halfway in and a halfway out kind of emphasis to rehabilitation in those cases where we have satisfied those concerns relating to the protection of the public and the deterrents for the offender.

I would like to mention some of the areas that might be marshalled within the community. I have alluded to them in my remarks on the integration of services. But we have a number of individuals and a number of groups within the community which we can marshal to this acceptance. We have people, such as people involved in halfway houses and halfway concepts, voluntary associations such as the John Howard Society, Elizabeth Fry, and many others which could become involved, educational and training institutions.

The Solicitor General alluded to projects which were undertaken in Calgary and Edmonton. The institutions such as junior colleges, technical institutes, and so on, are willing to become involved in this kind of manpower resource development. And I guess it takes us to perhaps marshal this support and integrate it into a service that can be used.

A fourth consideration I would like to express is that there are things we can do, manpower development resources which we can develop within the institution. I am not so sure that I agree with the statement of the Harradence Commission when they say that these two are completely incompatible. Well, be it as it may, the fact of the matter is that there are people who are going to be incarcerated and are not going to be released very often for day parole. I am suggesting that we have to do something for those people who are going to be incarcerated and remain within the walls of an institution. I think we can add a training emphasis. Those of you who have seen the Drumheller experience, although it is fraught with certain difficulties, it has provided a kind of training emphasis and an approach to rehabilitation which we can perhaps use within our provincial jurisdiction.

I am not talking about a response which says, "idle hands make mischief" or anything like that. I am talking about a conscious effort to develop the skills, to develop a training for those people within the institution, and in addition to this, to provide once again those integrated kinds of services which I earlier mentioned for both those inside and outside the institution.

A final consideration, a final observation I would make, is that it is going to take a lot of leadership, planning, evaluation and considered reform by the Solicitor General's department. Many of these things, as I said, have occurred in the past. But they haven't occurred under the leadership of an integrated kind of effort. And I am sure, under a blueprint for corrections, we will find this within the Solicitor General's department.

It is very important in the recruitment of personnel, the recruitment of a deputy minister, the recruitment of wardens. Perhaps we can more effectively use our advisory committee on corrections as a public link between our public service, between the department and the public at large.

In closing, I would say it is my contention that there is room for a manpower development, a manpower resource emphasis in corrections, not only under a humanitarian but a very societal mandate, and I am sure we will all support the Solicitor General in this most critical aspect of her responsibilities.

Thank you.

DR. PAPROSKI:

Mr. Speaker, as I stand to make a statement on this bill, The Corrections Amendment Act, 1974, I want it recorded that I firmly support the statements made on this side of the House regarding the bill, and very specially the firm comments made by the hon. members for Cypress, Calgary McKnight, and the hon. minister.

I would like to congratulate the hon. minister for the very excellent work she is doing. Keep it up.

Thank you.

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, there are one or two remarks I would like to make on Bill No. 11. I, too, would like to say that the Solicitor General, I think, has a cabinet post at the present time that offers the greatest challenge of any cabinet post opposite. The thoughts of law and order, how we are going to rehabilitate people who have fallen afoul of the law - those kinds of things are very, very important because we are dealing with human beings. I am sure she will do as thorough a job in that particular case as she has been doing over the past number of months with the Alberta Health Care plan.

It has been my privilege over the years, as a member, to make periodic visits to the different institutions throughout our province, and in particular the Calgary Correctional Institution. I have had many opportunities to go up there and interview different inmates and also to observe some of the rehabilitation and other programs that are going on within the institution.

I would like to congratulate and offer my thanks to Warden Jackson, who I feel is a man who has gone more than the last mile as far as trying to rehabilitate those people within his care. I would like to express, too, the gratefulness of the people of the City of Calgary that when a strike was called by the staff there - by some of the staff - he was able to carry on and work with a number of people within the institution so that there was no disruption or disturbance of any kind. And I think that is a real credit to him.

I would also like to say, Mr. Speaker, and directly to the Solicitor General, I am pleased that Warden Jackson hasn't walked away from the concern he has for the rehabilitation of prisoners, because he will be actively working with the John Howard Society. Although some people may disagree or agree with what he is doing, I think it is a good thing that he has not left completely the work he has been carrying on over the years. I think he will be a great liaison between the community and the institution and I am sure that is his intention. The John Howard Society has done great work over the years and will continue to do it.

I have one or two suggestions and I was quite interested in the remarks by the hon. Member for Calgary McKnight who has done a fairly thorough study of the situation. I think his views were, rather than a layman's view, a sort of academic view of the situation, but that's not to his discredit. I think that it is good that he has taken time out to make a study of it because the Harradence report did come to the conclusion, I believe, that rehabilitation should be carried out outside the confinement of the walls of the institution rather than within.

That being the case, I'm going to make what I consider a radical departure from our present system of incarceration of prisoners. By doing so, I think it will help us as far as the community working with us in rehabilitation. Under the present time in our province all the people who are in the confinement of our institutions in the province are people who are serving two years less a day.

Maybe we should look at this suggestion, Mr. Speaker, that where a person has been convicted twice for a criminal offence, then some arrangements should be made, I believe, to place that person in an institute operated by the federal branch. Because he has had his opportunity, and I say that for this reason, that I'm sure we could get the public to cooperate more with us if we said, look, everyone who is in our institution for a criminal

offence - this is his first offence as far as it is the first time he has been convicted anyway. Then I think you would get away from the stigma as well - I don't want to work with them because they're all bad characters. I think anyone who has slipped once should have every opportunity to rehabilitate himself or herself.

I believe you have to have greater cooperation within the staff at the institutions, where they have more say in what happens to a prisoner when it comes to day parole or any privilege outside the institution. I would even go so far as to say that no day parole or offer to go to work during the day or anything like that be allowed until the warden and the staff have recommended him for that.

I understand there are some cases where as soon as the chap gets in it's almost no time at all until he's on the outside on day parole. But I think that should be a privilege granted only after a chance for the staff to review him, to see if he is going to cooperate, because if he won't cooperate with the institution he's certainly not going to cooperate on the outside either. I think this is one test we could use.

I think we should also look at the fact that we have a lot of people who are granted day parole and who go out to work at jobs or to attend university. I would like to see us try to cooperate with the Department of National Defence. A young person, or an older person for that matter - but in this case it would be mostly a younger person who would be interested in it I'm sure - why, instead of day parole and going back and forth to work, why couldn't the army accept him. He could work his time out within the army under certain restrictions, because in many cases with a lot of the young people it's discipline they need more than anything else. It's a thought I've had for some time, that this would be just as advantageous as sending him out on day parole to go downtown to work in a packing plant or wherever he happens to be working.

For that reason, I suggest that we look seriously at trying to work with the federal government, that where a man has been convicted more than once of a criminal offence we try and get that person into a federal institution. It would also help in the case of segregation. I'm sure that a lot of people who have their boy in an institution would feel a lot better if they knew that everyone who was associated with him was a first offender. I believe this would go a long way in rehabilitation, in taking a more positive attitude towards rehabilitation.

With those few remarks, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to have the Solicitor General enlarge on the principle of Section 29 where we are going to penalize people who have been contravening this particular Act. I was wondering what brought this situation about - the reason for that, the principle in having that section added.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BENOIT:

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say a few words concerning this bill. Particularly, I'm thinking in terms of the changes of the name to 'correction services' and some of the definitions that have been outlined. At the risk of being misunderstood because of the short time that is at my disposal, I want to make a few remarks with regard to some alternative methods that could be used for correcting offenders of the law.

I think that the hon. Member for Cypress touched off a note that was carried on by some others with regard to the need for taking, in some cases, a hard line with criminals. Sometimes when we talk about correcting, we are talking in love and kindness toward the criminal and, as has been pointed out, with little concern for the people who have been victimized by the criminal.

Sometimes we need to take into consideration that there are all kinds of people who violate the laws of the land, and that there are some who are incorrigible and they will have to be dealt with in one way. There are several kinds who can be corrected, but there are a variety of kinds of corrections that have to be applied. There are certain types of people who have become hardened through years of violation of laws, of disobedience to parents probably in the first place, who need and understand only one kind of language, and that is a hard line.

I think that when we are meting out penalties in the courts to those who have broken the law, there are several things that should be kept in mind. One of them should be justice. Someone has said that law and justice just don't go hand in hand, but I believe that they can go hand in hand if the law is made right and those who mete out the penalties understand justice.

I think that justice should be rendered not only to the criminal for the crime that he has committed, but that also a great consideration should be given to justice for the person who has been victimized by the criminal. Therefore, the penalty should take into consideration what the criminal can do to make restitution for the crime that he has committed, restitution to the person or persons who were offended or restitution to the

state, if need be. As has been pointed out by the Harradence Report and could be pointed out from a number of other reports, incarceration in jails does not lend itself to rehabilitation. Therefore, the penalty should include some consideration for rehabilitation as well as restitution.

I firmly believe that there is a place in our society in conjunction with justice where we could well do away with both fines and prisons, because it's a pretty well-known fact that neither fines nor imprisonment are rehabilitating people nor deterring them from repetition of the crime, or doing anything to deter other people who are watching what is going on so far as penalties are concerned.

It has been suggested by the hon. Member for Calgary Millican that a work camp is much better in lots of instances for the morale and for the correction than imprisonment. Anybody who goes to prison is a real burden to the state so far as finances are concerned. It costs roughly \$1,000 a month to keep a man in prison, probably costing half that much to keep his family at home. If he is the type of person who has not any responsibility or any sense of responsibility he considers that this is much easier than trying to make an honest living. As a result we have all kinds of people who are a burden to the state and to their families, who could be corrected some other way.

Certainly if people are going to be rehabilitated, prison is not the place to rehabilitate them. The best place to rehabilitate them is in society, having them assume their regular responsibilities so that they may be aware of the fact that by violating the law they do not get away with it by simply paying a fine, which is not much of a deterrent in this affluent society and age in which we live. If they do not want to pay the fine they simply take the alternative of going to prison, which creates a burden to society, as I've pointed out.

So if somehow we could put them back into society and make them continue their responsibilities in society and to society and still have a penalty attached to it that would be a reminder of the crime they had committed, it might be a deterrent, not only to repeating the crime, but a deterrent to those who were looking on. Then we would have solved part of our problem. I have read at considerable length of some instances in the [United] States where magistrates have had the opportunity and the privilege of administering whatever type of penalty they deemed fit to suit the crime and the criminal who had committed the crime. In some instances they do some very menial tasks, in other instances they are put on probation under certain circumstances that are much more meaningful than either fines or imprisonment.

I give an example of a young teenager who is violating the law and screeching his tires down the street and creating a hazard. He may be brought before the magistrate and ordinarily he would be fined and the chances are, in this affluent society, that about eight out of ten parents will pay the fine, so that there is no deterrent and no penalty whatever attached so far as the young man is concerned. On the other hand, if the magistrate did not fine him but had him washing the street and taking the tire marks off a street three times a week for a month, it would be something that he would not forget. It could be an embarrassment but it wouldn't do him any harm.

There are a number of things that could be done. The hon. Member for Calgary Millican mentioned the need for giving serious consideration to second and third time offenders and dealing with them probably in alternative ways.

There was a method that was used at one time that was very effective and that was the use of the lash. Some people have said that we ought not to do anything so cruel, but when you take a look at what happens to people when they have been mugged or kidnapped or raped, or any of a number of other things that people do these days, the motorcycle gangs that beat their opponents to death with chains and things of that sort, the lash is a comparatively mild treatment when you consider what the criminal has done in a good many instances. One lash for the first offence, two for the second, four for the third, and so on, is something that the criminal will not forget.

There is need for consideration of some other methods of dealing with criminals other than the conventional types of methods we have been using which we know have not been effective. They have not been rehabilitating, they have not been deterring, they have not been making restitution, and the criminal has not been paying for his crime as much as society has been paying for it. Therefore we need to have a reconsideration of the entire matter of correction.

When we talk about the correction officer and correction services, I think it's a good thing for us to put the emphasis on correction - not a case of penalizing him, not a case of being vindictive or just giving him a penalty for the sake of punishing him, but giving him a penalty that will in some way rehabilitate him, make restitution for his crime, and render justice to the person who has been victimized, so that there has indeed been a correction made, not only so far as his crime is concerned but so far as his own self and his attitude is concerned.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I throw that out for consideration, not necessarily a hard line for the sake of being vindictive, but a hard line to deal with the kind of people who only understand what the hard line is. I am 100 per cent in agreement with correcting people who have mental or psychological problems in that particular way, with that kind of treatment, but when it comes to the ordinary case-hardened criminal, there is only one language that he understands and that's the kind of language which will have to be used by the courts of the land in order to give a fair and just consideration to all persons concerned, the victimized as well as the criminal himself.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER:

May the hon. minister conclude the debate?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MISS HUNLEY:

Mr. Speaker, since time is running out, I'll try to be very brief. I would like to express appreciation to those members who have been so supportive and so interested and concerned in this very troubled field.

To the hon. Member for Cypress, if everyone lived by those standards, which I admire very much, I'm sure my work would be so much easier and the world would be a better place.

To the hon. Member for Calgary McKnight, the outline that he gave in his speech is very helpful and I'm sure will be of great assistance to me when I'm making some final decisions during the months that lie ahead.

To those who spoke of Warden Jackson, I would like to say to them that I met with Warden Jackson only on three occasions since assuming office. Each time our meeting was interesting and amicable and I was looking forward to working with him. It was with regret that I heard of his resignation. I believe he has obtained employment at a job which he will enjoy and to which he will contribute, and I wish him well.

To the question from the hon. Member for Calgary Millican relating to Section 29, we have a problem, Mr. Speaker, with people leaving contraband either in the institutions or in the surroundings. This is primarily aimed at them and people outside the institution who create problems for those inside.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I would thank those who contributed to the debate in a responsible way, of whom there were a number.

[The motion was carried. Bill No. 11 was read a second time.]

MR. SPEAKER:

Before the House adjourns, perhaps I might be permitted to make a brief reference to an incident yesterday evening. Some unparliamentary matter crept into the debate. I did intervene but did not go on as far as hon. members might have expected. I was not positive of the exact purport of the language used and the context. I have since read an unofficial transcript of the relevant portion of Hansard, and I would respectfully ask hon. members not to take the incident as being in any way a precedent as to what I might feel obliged to do on a future similar occasion.

The House stands adjourned until tomorrow afternoon at 2:30 o'clock.

[The House rose at 5:30 o'clock.]